

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## AMERICA'S VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

## HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the news reports too often show us the behavior of the selfish and self-seeking, I would like to focus our attention for a moment on the work of a very different sort of person. I am referring to the volunteer firemen, who give so generously of their time to make their areas safer and their neighbors more secure.

They do not go on strike, do not seek double time, do not waste their efforts in job actions, do not cost the taxpayers huge sums of money.

In return, I do not think it is much to expect that we do all within our power to see that they can afford to continue their operations. Inflation has hit all of us, and the volunteer firemen are not immune to its impact. A not insignificant part of their economic woes comes in the form of federal taxation on commodities essential to the maintenance of fire prevention services—telephone and communication devices, gasoline, diesel, special fuels and vehicles. I have joined with several of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to exempt these local departments from these Federal excise taxes, just as other nonprofit groups are exempted.

The following article written by Dan Tabler of the State News provides an insightful glance into the contributions and efforts of volunteer firemen:

## VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

(By Dan Tabler)

The fellow in the big boots, heavy coat and fireman's helmet whirls a large axe and punches a hole in the roof of a burning building.

A couple of curious by-standers comment aloud: "That's all those guys do—break down doors, smash windows and throw a little water. They do more damage than the fire."

Somebody else chimes in: "Yeah, they just want to ride on the back of the fire engine, blow the siren and run red lights."

It is a bum rap 99 per cent of the time.

The volunteer fire fighter is a dedicated fellow who could be your next door neighbor, a state probation officer, a minister and, yes, even a newspaper editor.

It would be silly to say that all of the nearly 15,000 volunteers in Maryland are perfect and that some of them didn't join to blow the siren and become involved in the excitement of a fire.

But the small towns of America (and even bigger ones like Dover) would be mighty hard-pressed financially to pay high insurance premiums or fund full-time fire companies were it not for the guys who leave their businesses in the day and their homes at night to answer the alarm.

Property owners on the Eastern Shore and throughout the Delmarva Peninsula are fortunate that fire training classes are the rule rather than the exception in most small town firehouses. There is a fine, well-equipped fire school outside Dover, and the University of

Maryland has one of the most modern such facilities in the nation.

An expected 250 firemen will give up watching that pro football game next Sunday to participate in a one-day fire school at Washington College in Chestertown, Md. They will start at 9 a.m. and finish about 5 p.m.

They won't be paid time and half, either. George Mayer, a long-time member of the Easton Fire Company, is also a part-time instructor with the University of Maryland Fire School. He has given more than 100 classes throughout the Eastern Shore and is still going strong.

As of this year, those classes, with 15 to 20 men each, run three hours a night, once a week, for 26 weeks.

They don't cost the public a dime in wages to the firemen, but they may save thousands of dollars or, quite possibly, a life when the man gets on the scene of an actual blaze.

As an example, in Queen Anne's County at the present time, there are 75 volunteers taking the basic fire training classes in Centerville, Grasonville and Romancoke. Beginning the first of the year, 65 more men in Kent County will be enrolled in various classes.

These fellows, as all the volunteers in Delaware and Maryland, are not expected to be paid for overtime, and rarely do they ever think of striking for better wages.

The average volunteer fire fighter is not looking for a hero's mantle, but he sure as hell hates to get slugged with a bum rap when he carries an axe to the roof and attempts to ventilate a smoky building so the fire can be located and extinguished.

Remember that the next time your fire company announces its annual fund drive. It's an important non-profit organization in your community.

## MICHAEL VALENTE: LONG BEACH, N.Y., LOST ONE OF ITS MOST DEDICATED AND CONTRIBUTING CITIZENS

## HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, the city of Long Beach, N.Y., lost one of its most dedicated and contributing citizens, Michael Valente.

Mike came to Long Beach when both he and the town were developing. His construction company took roots and over the years has provided Long Beach with its most outstanding homes. He not only gave of his talents through his homes, but contributed his citizenship through his activities as city marshal and court attendant until his retirement 8 years ago.

But Mike Valente's outstanding character and contributions did not stop in Long Beach. His meritorious service during World War I brought him the highest award this country can offer, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I, of course, knew Mike Valente personally having been brought up in the city of Long Beach and always knew the pride the community had in this fine

man who was one of our Nation's true heroes.

Mike died at the age of 80 in this, our Bicentennial Year. But his passing does not bring with it a forgetting of the man who gave so much to so many. He is memorialized in the list of men who so highly distinguished themselves in the line of duty—the Congressional Medal of Honor—and his name is inscribed in the hearts of the thousands who knew and loved him.

I insert an article which recently appeared in the local Long Beach newspaper, the Nassau Star, which provides a detailed and fitting memorial to this great citizen:

## MICHAEL VALENTE, CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDER

Michael Valente, Congressional Medal of Honor holder and long time resident of Long Beach, died January 10th at the age of 80.

Mr. Valente came to Long Beach in its early, developing years. His construction company built many of Long Beach's beautiful homes. A solid and devoted citizen, he served as City Marshal and Court Attendant until his retirement eight years ago.

Having emigrated at the age of 18 from his native St. Apollinare, Italy, Valente made his first home in Ogdensburg, New York. He had been in the country only three years when he enlisted in Company D of the New York National Guard. It was then that Valente started down the road that would lead him to the trenches of World War I France and the immortality of having his name inscribed in the distinguished line of men on the Medal of Honor Roll.

Valente's regiment was activated during the American campaign against the Mexican bandit, Pancho Villa. Although the men were itching to see action on that front, Company D did not see action until it was absorbed into the 27th division instead and sent overseas to fight in France with the British.

The Medal of Honor is the highest distinction which can be earned by a member of the Armed Services. It is awarded by the President, in the name of Congress, to an individual who, while serving in the Armed Forces, "distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty." The first Medal of Honor was awarded during the Civil War.

The details of Michael Valente's act of courage are contained in the citation he received with the medal. It reads as follows:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy during operations against the Hindenburg line, east of Ronssoy, France, 29 September 1918. Finding the advance of his organization held up by a withering enemy machinegun fire, Private Valente volunteered to go forward. With utter disregard of his own personal danger, accompanied by another soldier, Private Valente rushed forward through an intense machinegun fire directly upon the enemy nest, killing two and capturing five of the enemy and silencing that gun. Discovering another machinegun nest nearby, which was pouring a deadly fire on the American forces, preventing their advance, Private Valente and his companion charged upon this strong point, killing the gunner and putting this machinegun out of action. Without hesitation they jumped into the enemy's trench, killed two and captured

16 German soldiers. Private Valente was later wounded and sent to the rear.

After recovering in England, Valente returned to the U.S. in March of 1919. Ten years later, President Herbert Hoover belatedly presented him with the Medal of Honor in Washington, D.C. During World War II, Valente served on the local board of the Selective Service in Nassau County.

"Mike" Valente became a popular and well-known figure in Long Beach. As an active citizen he was often called upon to lead the parade on Memorial Day or be the Guest of Honor at functions which represented the ideals he had fought for.

Michael Valente was a hero in Long Beach and in his unassuming way served as an inspiration for many throughout his fifty years in the community. He was part of Long Beach and enjoyed it to the fullest with his family around him. He is memorialized through the city by the houses he built, and the apartment building and the Jewish War Veterans' scholarship fund that bear his name. In addition, his name is forever inscribed in a stain glass window for Medal of Honor holders in his National Land Mark designated 7th Regiment Armory in New York. These tributes to his memory are lasting and appropriate, symbolizing the man in his context.

Valente is survived by two daughters, Mary Madalena, of Long Beach, and Josephine Cuneo, of Lido Beach; a son, Anthony, of Unidale; three grandchildren and a great-grandchild.

Mr. Valente's family members also include Mr. John V. Scaduto, Long Beach Republican Leader and Treasurer of Nassau County.

#### PUBLIC WORKS BILL IS INVESTMENT IN FUTURE

**HON. KENNETH L. HOLLAND**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today the House is scheduled to vote on final passage of the conference report to H.R. 5247, the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act. I strongly support this legislation and am hopeful that President Ford will sign it into law.

In fiscal year 1976 the Federal Government spent \$19.4 billion on unemployment compensation. Surely we could better invest \$6.2 billion in the employment of our citizens—mostly in the private sector—rather than perpetuating the expensive and demoralizing unemployment lines.

The advantages of H.R. 5247 over other public service jobs are numerous. The foremost is probably the fact that the jobs to be created are in the private sector and for the permanent benefit of a community. The money will not be spent on many of the traditional make-work projects but rather on the construction or renovation of permanent local facilities such as schools, municipal offices, water and sewage treatment plants.

This legislation is urgently needed by our hard-pressed State and local governments, by small businesses in distressed areas all over the country and by jobless Americans. There is not an area of the country which would not permanently

benefit from one or more provisions of H.R. 5247. The equalizing of the complex formula written by the Office of Management and Budget for the allocation of water pollution control construction moneys is of particular help to the 33 least urbanized States. My State of South Carolina, badly in need of construction money to curb pollution and able to use such funds immediately, will gain a much-needed 41 million dollars. Communities across the country can use these funds to supplement local, State and other Federal moneys to begin work immediately on long-delayed projects.

Of itself, this legislation will not and cannot resolve all the problems of recession, unemployment and inflation that have troubled us so long. However, this bill will remove hundreds of thousands of men and women from the unemployment and welfare rolls, making them contributing taxpayers and thereby ease significantly the financial drain on their communities. It will also enable their communities to get on with their job of providing proper public service to all their citizens.

Across our country in this Presidential election year, there is a great debate and division surrounding what is carelessly called "Federal spending." It is time for someone to distinguish between Federal spending and Federal investment. This legislation provides for investment in the future.

Officials and citizens await the passage of this legislation so that they may responsibly commence rebuilding our economy, our future and, indeed, our Nation itself.

#### UNENFORCED LAWS CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEATH OF THE FAMILY FARM

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as legislators we all know the importance of our role in a democratic society. We are responsible for establishing national policies, and priorities. Among the policies we have adopted is a national policy in favor of the small family-owned farm. Our Western States were developed with Federal funds, under Federal programs that required that the benefits of the Federal dollar flow to the small landowner. Unfortunately, these Federal laws have been flagrantly violated, and the violations have been ignored by those pledged to uphold the law. These violations tend to make a mockery of the actions of the legislative branch.

I expect that we will be hearing more about this sorry state of affairs, especially since a Senate committee is looking into this matter. At this time I would only want to place a background article on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article from the January 11, 1976, issue of the San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle follows:

#### THE \$2 BILLION GIVEAWAY

(By Lynn Ludlow and Will Hearst)

THREE ROCKS, FRESNO COUNTY.—Paper farmers, absentee landowners and several big corporations reap most benefits from a federal irrigation project that was supposed to redistribute huge landholdings into family farms.

Thousands of small farmsteads were promised within the Westlands Water District from a taxpayer investment estimated at \$2 billion in various subsidies.

Shaped like a fat green cucumber on the dusty west side of the San Joaquin Valley, the 572,072-acre irrigation district was formed in 1952 by corporate growers and landowners seeking federal help to replenish their sinking water table.

Their spokesman in Congress, Rep. B. F. Sisk, D-Fresno, predicted family farms in the thousands "sharing the productivity and the bounty of fertile lands blossoming with an ample supply of water."

With the cheap water came reclamation law. This imposed a 160-acre limit per farm owner. He is supposed to inhabit or be "an occupant" of the 160 acres.

In return for up to 10 years of water at exceptionally low cost the great landowners signed agreements to sell off their holdings in 160-acre farms at the appraised pre-water price.

This would return people to the land, challenge the long trend toward corporate control of farmlands in America and test the ever-popular notion that bigness is better.

By now, with more than 100,000 acres sold off during the first decade of reclamation, 300 to 600 owner-operated farms of 160 acres or less should have been started.

The result so far: Two.

This remains corporation country with huge farming operations, vast fields and big tax advantages. Missing from its flat landscape are barns, chicken coops, 4-H clubs, silos, kids with fishing poles, John Deere tractors (too small) and inhabitants.

Not since Teapot Dome's oil lease giveaways have public resources been exploited so flagrantly—with the active aid of government officials—for private gain.

A two-month Examiner investigation shows the U.S. Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Reclamation are unable or unwilling to implement the land redistribution mandated by Congress, required by law, upheld by courts and promised by politicians.

To city folks, with problems of their own, it's more than a simple issue of law and order. Wetlands has become a fat example of growing corporate control of rural America and what might be termed the government-agribusiness complex.

One result is an industrial technology imposed on the nation's farms. This raises questions about use of energy, threats to the environment (the Delta, for example), tax subsidies of all kinds, migration to the cities and the reason why tomatoes feel like baseballs, taste like chemicals and cost 69 cents a pound.

To country people, the effects are less abstract. A two-room hovel on the edge of this drab hamlet illustrates the shattered promise of land for the landless—a promise buttressed by a decade of federally-subsidized irrigation that increased the value of farmlands here by tenfold.

Although some new housing was built here in a government self-help program, the shanty sits in a lot next to abandoned hulks of farm machinery. Windows are boarded. Part of the roof is open to the sky. Walls are chinked with cardboard. The house doesn't have electricity, water or sanitation.

This is home for a farm laborer, his pregnant wife, their two children and a dog. In Spanish, the young woman says her husband is at work in cotton fields nearby.

Like other tillers of the soil in corporation



country, he is paid by the hour and commutes to his job like a factory worker.

These cotton fields are among the 100,000 acres already sold in 160-acre units in technical compliance with the law. As current agreements with landowners come due in the next 10 to 20 years, most of the 572,072 acres in the district will have been divided into quarter sections (160 acres).

If the law were strictly enforced, Westlands (and other federal reclamation districts) would have become a new frontier offering opportunity to thousands of men and women. In this district alone, more than 3,000 small farms would be possible.

Instead, these are fields without farmhouses. The laborer from Three Rocks works on 160-acre tracts owned by a consortium of absentee investors, leased to a management firm, farmed as a single unit and worked by cropdusters, D-8 Caterpillars, air-conditioned harvesting units and as few field hands as possible.

"It's the best land anywhere," says Jessie de la Cruz, a lifelong field worker who represents a farming cooperative that is trying, without success, to buy land here.

"I measured the land by the inch because I worked with an 8-inch hoe 10 hours a day," she told U.S. senators in July.

"When the canals were built out there, we were looking at it as a future for the farm workers to own our family farms, but the big growers would look at the water. Instead of seeing people and family farms, they were looking at dollar signs."

Because it involves so many dollar signs in direct subsidies to big landowners such as Southern Pacific and Standard Oil, the Westlands project has become Exhibit A in growing criticism of the federal Bureau of Reclamation.

Critics don't necessarily agree on whether the 160-acre limitation is practical today. Some sympathize with the bureau's role in attempting to enforce a complex set of laws without backing from rural congressmen, the White House or the Department of Justice. All agree the law's goals have been subverted into an arrangement between big corporations and government that one critic calls "state socialism."

The bureau's contract to provide water to Westlands is the costliest in history. The district itself is the largest in the nation.

With 894 square miles, most of its fields receiving federal irrigation, the district on the western fringe of Fresno and Kings counties is nearly as big as Rhode Island.

Author William Saroyan, in his recollections of boyhood among the fig and raisin farms near Fresno, referred to the San Joaquin Valley's west side as "the desert."

The same words are used today by Russell Giffen, 74, the shrewd corporate farmer who went there in 1934 to build a cotton empire.

With but 7 inches of annual rainfall, the west side wasn't good then for much more than spring grazing.

It was once included in the 14 million acres of California amassed by Henry Miller, the ranch king, in a tradition of government generosity that continues until this day. To qualify for grants under the Swamp Lands Act of 1850, for example, Miller hitched up a rowboat and dragged it across valley grass.

Water was discovered here as a consequence of oil drilling.

With wells as deep as 2,500 feet, Giffen and others mined water from the underground basin in prodigious amounts.

Laden with salts, the well water killed off most crops. It didn't seem to bother cotton, barley, melons and safflower.

The water table began to sink.

The owners of the few small farms were forced to sell out when their wells went

dry. Giant pumps and 2,500-foot wells were for big operators.

It became corporation country. The major landowners are Southern Pacific, with 106,000 acres in checkerboard sections, and Standard Oil, Bangor Punta Inc. (Producers Cotton Co.), Giffen Inc., Anderson, Clayton Co. and Getty Oil.

The annual overdrafts from the water basin caused the land itself to subside in what geologist J. F. Poland calls "one of the great changes man has imposed on his environment."

Fields settled as much as 30 feet, cracking foundations and crushing well casings.

It was a crisis for the landowners. They formed the Westlands Water District in 1952 on the usual basis of one dollar (of assessed valuation), one vote.

The board sought help from the federal government. The landowners hoped to be exempted from the 160-acre limitation, which would mean, if strictly enforced, their departure from the land. The alternative was a new dust bowl.

#### THE LAW

Like the Swamp Lands Act, the Desert Lands Act and the grants of public land to railroads, the Homestead Act failed in its goal of placing independent settlers on the land.

When Congress drafted the National Reclamation Act in 1902, irrigation and land reform were tied together from the beginning.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who signed the law, saw it as a way to prevent revolution. "Now I have struck the crux of my appeal," he told San Francisco's Commonwealth Club in a 1911 debate.

"I wish to save the very wealthy men of this country and their advocates and upholders from the ruin they would bring upon themselves if they were permitted to have their way."

"I wish to secure this country against ever seeing a time when the 'have-nots' shall rise against the 'haves,'" he told the clubmen.

The populist law was intended as a fair deal for landowner, buyer and society. Nobody is required to buy federally subsidized water. If he does, four basic rules are set forth in the 1902 law and later statutes.

Federally subsidized water cannot be delivered by the irrigation district, which acts as middleman, to more than 160 acres per farm owner.

The recipient must be a "bona fide resident on such land or occupant thereof residing in the neighborhood."

In return for up to 10 years of very cheap irrigation, land in excess of 160 acres must be sold off in 160-acre parcels.

The sale price must be appraised at the pre-project value at the signing of the 10-year agreement.

The law has been nibbled to pieces by legal decrees from the Department of the Interior.

First to go was the residency rule. It's the key to the law's effectiveness but tough to administer and police. It was voided arbitrarily on the argument that Congress, in strengthening reclamation laws in 1926, didn't repeat the part about residency.

Now pending in the Ninth U.S. Judicial Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco is the government's appeal of a 1971 ruling which upheld the residency requirement.

In the suit filed in 1969 by 123 land-seeking farmworkers in the Imperial Irrigation District, U.S. District Judge William D. Murray said an administrative agency cannot repeal an Act of Congress.

Officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Westlands district told the Examiner they hope his ruling will be overturned.

"Failure to enforce residency subverts the excess land limitation," said Murray. "The policy behind reclamation law, to aid and encourage owner-operated farms, requires enforcement of the residency requirement to prevent these violations."

San Francisco attorney Arthur Brunwasser, who argued the case for the landless farmworkers, finds it ironic that the opposition comes from government attorneys who are supposed to administer reclamation law.

Brunwasser expects the appellate court's decision, whatever it is, to be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The high court has already spoken. In 1958, basic provisions of reclamation law were upheld in *Ivanhoe v. McCracken*, a San Joaquin Valley case.

The court said the 160-acre limitation "insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large landholdings."

Decrees by the Bureau of Reclamation have expanded the limitation to 640 acres by permitting 320 acres for man and wife and 160 acres apiece in trust for two children.

The bureau also allows another gimmick not provided by the law itself. It says various members of a large family, including in-laws and children, may hold the equivalent of 160 acres in undivided interests. This is like owning a percentage of a large piece of property.

Groups of unrelated absentee buyers are also allowed to buy 160-acre parcels in land that will be leased or sharecropped as a single unit.

One such transaction was approved by the Bureau of Reclamation but led to a criminal conspiracy indictment by the U.S. Attorney's office. Trial is still pending for Fresno real estate developer John Bonadelle on a charge of evading the National Reclamation Act, but neither buyer nor seller were hauled into court.

#### THE WATER

Rafters on the American River, houseboaters at Shasta Lake and fishermen at Whiskeytown have something in common with the corporate farm operators of the Westlands. They use the same water.

Stored in the great network of federal reservoirs and released in the dry season into the Sacramento River and its tributaries, the water is sucked from the Delta by the Tracy pumping plant and deposited in the San Luis Canal/California Aqueduct.

It's a joint federal-state operation for the first 102 miles, serving the Westlands and two small reclamation districts, Panoche and San Joaquin. The water is stored in the huge San Luis Reservoir, then released at 13,100 cubic feet per second down the concrete ditch that borders the Westlands district.

From the canal, water flows into an underground system of pipes five feet in diameter. Each quarter section has its own turnout, a great faucet rising above the grapes and tomatoes.

As the underground water basin is gradually recharged, the imported water is supplemented by water from the deep wells. These were turned over to the district by the landowners.

After irrigation, waste must be drained from the croplands because of a thick layer of clay—the ancient bottom of Tulare Lake—that might otherwise cause flooding by water now laden with salts, pesticides, fertilizer and other pollutants.

The drain system pumps the waste water to a drying pond to the north. Eventually, the Bureau of Reclamation hopes to build the San Luis Drain, which will dump the waste water into San Francisco Bay.

An acre foot of water is enough to fill an acre to the depth of one foot, or about 326,000 gallons. Under its pending contract with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Westlands dis-

tract will get 1.15 million acre feet a year. This is 375 billion gallons.

Landowners are now paying \$7.50 an acre foot, which is a third the cost to customers of the California Water Project and less than half the cost of pumping from deep wells.

The rationale behind this bargain in Westlands, of course, was the belief that family farmers could use the subsidies in water prices.

#### THE DEALS

Land transfer documents filed with the Fresno County recorder show that the 1902 law is treated by federal officials as something of an annoyance.

Title to one large holding passed through a dozen hands and a friendly foreclosure, all with the assent of the Bureau of Reclamation. Then it returned to the original excess landowner, Harris Farms, Inc.

In another case, 3,390 acres was sold by Giffen Inc. to 22 buyers. The list is headed by wives of adjoining farm property owners, Frank Telles and Jess P. Telles Jr. of Firebaugh. The others include various relatives and in-laws.

The acreage was sold in 17 parcels, put together as a single package and distributed to the 22 buyers in undivided interests. The share of each owner is less than 160 acres, assuming it could somehow be separated from the rest.

In yet another twist of the law, Anderson, Clayton & Co. sold 623 acres (for \$320,000) to Dura-Style Homes, Inc., which is not a family farmer.

It was then resold to two married couples in San Jose, who held the acreage in undivided interests. The couples leased the property to Vista del Llano, a farm management operation.

Vista del Llano is owned by Anderson, Clayton & Co.

Without federal irrigation or an underground water table, most land in the district would be worth no more than \$100 to \$200 an acre, according to county appraisers and others.

Actual value today is about \$1,500 an acre. Because the law requires a "pre-project" price, the Bureau of Reclamation is generous by allowing \$500 to \$600 an acre.

Even so, it's the bargain of the century for the absentee investors. Virtually all buyers are friends and relatives of the sellers.

The public lost a mere \$80 million in the Teapot Dome oil scandals that sent the secretary of the interior to prison 50 years ago as the fall guy. In the Westlands, the losses are more than money.

A district spokesman concedes that Westlands production would have dropped to \$25 million or less without federal water.

The district's fields sank in elevation as much as 30 feet while the big farm operators pumped out the underground reservoirs.

As the vast majority of federal taxpayers, city folks pay most of the water bill. Over the next 40 years, the federal subsidies are estimated at about \$2 billion.

The sum is unimaginable. If the dollar bills were taped end to end, a green ribbon would circle the earth seven times with enough left for a fancy bow. If \$2,000 were put aside each day starting with the founding of Rome in 753 B.C., the cache wouldn't quite total \$2 billion yet.

The belief that big farms are the price of progress is challenged by government studies that show the one-man farm is probably as efficient as the factory farm universal in these parts.

"In fact, it's even more efficient on occasion," says one U.S. Department of Agriculture report.

The trend toward factory farming could have been reversed in the Westlands Water District, but a search by the Examiner produced only two farm operations that appear

to meet the law's land redistribution requirements.

Doyle Buhler, a bachelor, lives on his 40-acre parcel near Mendota. It includes 30 acres of pistachios, and Buhler says he supports himself entirely with his crop.

David Olivera farms 160 acres of cotton and sugar beets with his brother within the Westlands district, but both live 10 miles away in Tranquillity. Olivera says the 160-acre farm wholly supports them.

More than 3,600 parcels of 160 acres or less are listed within the district. Most are leased to farm operators by their absentee owners. A few are home base for farmers who also lease nearby fields, and a few are owned by farm operators with supplemental income.

No farmhouses are visible along the 80-mile stretch of Interstate 5 as it skirts the district between the Mendota and Kettleman City turnoffs.

Orchards, vineyards and new row crops, nourished by water from the San Luis Canal/California Aqueduct, are planted in sections a mile square.

Scores of would-be farmers have petitioned without the slightest success for farm properties made available by the 160-acre limitation. Sales are controlled by the sellers. The Bureau of Reclamation has no formal rules to assist potential buyers.

"We're not in the right club," says Sal Gonzales, executive director of Westside Planning, which is sponsored by the U.S. Community Services Agency.

Gonzales has spent three years trying to find farmland in the Westlands district for low-income families, and he can tap banks and government institutions for some financial aid. It hasn't helped.

Public records show most 160-acre buyers are paper farmers. Like the fowls of the air, neither do they reap, nor do they sow, nor gather into barns. Instead, they have front money, inside connections, an interest in tax shelters and the direct aid of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Dominated by engineers and dam builders, the agency needs support from rural congressmen for an apparently endless series of dam and canal projects in western America.

Although land redistribution was supposed to be part of reclamation policy, bureau officials told the Examiner without hesitation that technical compliance is all that is normally required.

The same policies exist in dozens of reclamation districts, but the Westlands contract has caught the attention of a U.S. Senate panel.

Hearings are scheduled in California next month by Sens. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., and Floyd Haskell, D-Colo., co-chairmen of a joint committee on small business and the interior. Its special concern is survival of the family farm.

At earlier hearings in Washington last summer, spokesmen for the Bureau of Reclamation and Westlands Water District defended their administration of the law. They said rulings are based on interpretations of long standing.

Although simple in result, few issues of the century are so complex in detail as the Westlands tangle of land, water, law and deals.

#### TWO-HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

#### HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on January 30, 1776, the Continental Congress, to enforce the con-

tractual obligations of the apprenticeship system, directed that apprentices from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland could be enlisted in the Continental Forces only if they had the consent, in writing, of their "master or mistress." The directive became necessary because many persons serving as apprentices had enlisted before they had completed their agreed voluntary service against the wishes of their masters and mistresses. Moreover, all apprentices enlisted without such consent were to be "immediately discharged from the service, on the application of \* \* \* their \* \* \* master or mistress, upon the payment of all just and reasonable charges of their (e) nlistment."

#### THE RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN FISHING INDUSTRY

#### HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, Americans making their livings from the sea are in trouble. Many countries with heavy investments in fishing are subsidizing their fishing industries to an unprecedented extent. In the cases of Russia and Japan, for example, fishing is a totally government-subsidized undertaking. This is having a serious effect on our own fishing industry.

Increasingly in the past decade, foreign fishing fleets have ventured close in to our shores, depleting fish stocks in U.S. coastal waters at an astonishing rate. Many species are near extinction as a direct result. Cumulatively, our fishing industry is close to extinction itself.

Our own industry has frantically pleaded its legitimate case, only to meet with indifference from much of the public. Many Americans today, therefore, are eating fish caught off our own shores which have been sold and reshipped to this country from foreign lands. If the Government does not act with vigor swiftly, there shall be no industry to salvage.

The House passed, and I was among those who supported it, a measure which would go a long way towards correcting this situation. Its major provisions are: First, extension of our country's fishery zone from 12 to 200 miles, effective July 1, 1976, except in the Gulf of Mexico, where a 12-mile fishery zone is retained until such time as the Secretary of Commerce determines there is a need to extend it. Second, a comprehensive conservation and management program governing all fishing within the zone. Third, priority rights to U.S. fishermen within the zone, with excess stocks to be shared with foreign nations. Fourth, exemptions of highly migratory fish from the bill, which it is believed will protect the interests of American tuna fishing fleets.

The other day the Senate passed a comparable measure, with some differences, especially in the date when such legislation would take effect. While I feel



that implementation of the measure is an urgent need, the difference of one year for implementation is certainly resolvable. Therefore, I urge that the conferees work out the differences as swiftly as possible so that the bill may be sent to the President for signature, a move he has indicated he will make.

The fishing business is one endeavor that built our country. Many thousands of jobs are at stake. The economic viability of many port cities is involved. Many millions of dollars are presently being expended for foreign fish imports which should be going into the pockets of American fishermen. Shipyards are sitting idle. Much of this state of affairs will change once the legislation in question is approved by the President and implemented. Certainly the bill is an important and overdue piece of legislation.

IN MEMORY OF MRS. LEONTYNE KING

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, January 23, 1976, the city of Los Angeles and the State of California lost one of its most dedicated civic and social leaders, Mrs. Leontyne King. Active in religious and political circles, Mrs. King was a 12-year member of the Los Angeles Library Commission and a cofounder of the Church of Divine Guidance. She served on the Library Commission longer than any other black in Los Angeles. She also served as a national vice president of the National Library Association.

Funeral services for Mrs. King were held today, Thursday, January 29, 1976, in Los Angeles at the Church of Divine Guidance, 1518 South Grammercy Place. The Rev. Clayton Russell officiated.

There are many tributes that can be paid to Mrs. King and much that can be said. However, I feel that the following article which appeared in the Los Angeles Sentinel today best expresses the feelings of all of her friends who knew and loved her:

MRS. LEONTYNE KING—"SHE WAS A LADY OF CLASS"

(By Jessie Mae Brown)

As International Women's Year reaches its mid-way mark, Mrs. Leontyne King, a modern day champion for "Women's Rights" is being laid to rest today (Thursday) after a losing battle with cancer.

The dignity with which she went about her work in the city of Los Angeles won her the reputation of being a truly gracious lady.

For twelve years she was a Los Angeles City Library Commissioner. During her stint of service, she was elected to the presidency and served on the national board.

When her term as a City Commissioner ended in 1973, Mrs. King continued to serve on the National Board.

She worked to get more jobs for black librarians and almost singlehandedly, successfully led a drive to save the Vernal Branch Library in the East side area.

Recognized as an astute business woman for years, Mrs. King was engaged in the management of her family business and properties.

The present fight for equal rights in the work-a-day world was not necessarily shared by Mrs. King, who like most black women leaders had always worked with her husband.

She was dedicated to making this a better community in which to live and wanted to see young black women excel as students and business women.

Leontyne King served on the Board of the Willfandel Club and spearheaded fund raising drives for scholarships and for the brick wall that presently encloses the garden area of the 5th Avenue and West Adams Club house.

As an advisor to the Star-Liters Club, she encouraged scholarship programs and as an Honorary member of Alpha Phi Chapter of Iota Phi Lambda Business and Professional Women's Sorority, she was pledged to encourage young women to strive for business careers through education.

Voted one of the 10 Best Dressed Women in the city of Los Angeles in the L.A. Sentinel Poll for a number of years, finally retiring to the Hall of Fame, Mrs. King attributed her fashion success to good grooming and wardrobe planning.

This she shared with many young people, as she coordinated fashion shows and lectured to them on the value of self improvement.

Funeral services will be held for Mrs. King today but the works of Mrs. King in this city, will live on... She was truly a lady.

REPORT THAT PRESIDENT FORD HAS ASKED ISRAEL NOT TO INTERFERE IN LEBANESE WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a statement issued last month by Dr. Joseph Sternstein, president of the Zionist Organization of America and leader of Temple Beth Shalom of Roslyn, N.Y. Dr. Sternstein had some interesting comments on the position taken by President Ford on the possibility of intervention in Lebanon and the need for prior consultation on such a matter. The statement follows:

REPORT THAT PRESIDENT FORD HAS ASKED ISRAEL NOT TO INTERFERE IN LEBANESE WAR, PUZZLING AND DISTURBING TO ZOA PRESIDENT

The report that President Ford has urged Israel not to interfere in the war between Moslem and Christians in Lebanon without prior consultation with the United States is puzzling and disquieting. The war in Lebanon has been instigated, and carried on by the Arab states, particularly Libya. Thousands of Syrian paramilitary and regular soldiers are participating in the attack on the Christian communities in Lebanon. Libya is pouring money, arms and men to the Moslem fighters.

The Moslem attack on the Christians is clearly part of the Pan Arab strategy and policy which hopes to eliminate non-Islamic Arabic people from the area. This is clearly an overture for a later strategic move against Israel to liquidate the Jewish State. We are wondering why the President singled out Israel with his oblique presentation. By limiting his consultation request to Israel, the President cleared the Arab states from responsibility of their involvement in the Lebanese War.

We wish to remind all concerned that a victory for the Moslems in Lebanon would put the country completely under Syrian

domination and constitute a mortal threat to Israel. We cannot expect Israel to remain indifferent to such a development. Israel had so far made clear that it has no intention of involving itself in the internal war in Lebanon. However, if the United States, the leading Western power, and the free world, especially the world Christian community, will continue to disregard the Moslem war for the liquidation of Christian Lebanon, the situation is bound to get out of hand with dire consequences for the situation in the Middle East.

It is worth noting that the United States commitment to Israel to consult on matters relating to the security and interest of the Jewish State was violated by the Administration, when it voted on November 30th in the Security Council against the wish of Israel for the Resolution which enabled the current President of the Council, the representative of the Soviet Union, to establish a precedent to recognize the PLO as a party to the Middle East conflict and invite the terrorist organization to participate in the Council's debate. Before asking Israel for consultations on Lebanon, our government should make certain that the United States itself is to live up to its commitment by consulting with Israel in matters relating to policies involving the Middle East developments affecting matters of peace and war.

To ask Israel to consult presents the possibility of situations developing that invite severe disagreements between Israel and the United States. Can Israel afford to permit her security to be determined by any other nation, including one as friendly as the United States? Should Israel be placed in a position where she is asked to refrain from action deemed necessary for her own security? Moreover, can the United States take the responsibility for the possibility that Israel will refrain from taking action and then find out when it is too late that her own judgment should have been followed? As a matter of fact, recent experience has indicated that intelligence information given to Israel by friendly powers has not always proved to be reliable.

Another factor to be considered, is the possibility that such "consultations" create a de facto military alliance. Should Israel take action with or without U.S. approval, it would ultimately involve the United States and therefore the question must be asked, is it a good policy for the United States to be so obligated or to be vulnerable to future charges of involvement in foreign military actions.

In the final analysis, the historic doctrine of self-defense, based on self-determination, is precious to every country, and Israel should not be asked to give up this important concept.

EULOGY OF PAUL ROBESON

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Ms. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad mission to call to the attention of the House the demise of Paul Robeson, an outstanding American and a leader of the black American community for the past half century and more.

He was not of my political persuasion, but no matter. He was a genius, a man of many talents, of great heart, great enthusiasm, remarkable personality, and a man of kindness and sympathy for sufferers in every land. His admirers

numbered in the millions. Had he sought a political path less controversial in nature, he could easily have become a millionaire. That he chose another path and insisted on saying so, publicly, without fear, rendered him anathema to those in whom respectability alone is ever the issue of the moment.

He is gone and I am grieved by the news, as are the legions who regard him as the singer par excellence of our generation, and several other generations.

#### THE BIG GUYS GO AFTER MILO'S TINY HOSPITAL

#### HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of Tuesday, January 27 contained an editorial by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick which makes an excellent point concerning the lengths to which the people of this country can be driven as a result of reams of bureaucratic red-tape. Since many of the rules and regulations which so disrupt the lives of individuals or the effectiveness of institutions bear little resemblance to the legislation they are intended to implement, I believe there is increasing momentum across the Nation for the form of increased congressional oversight provided by H.R. 8231 and identical bills. The column by Mr. Kilpatrick is included at this point in the RECORD:

THE "BIG GUYS" GO AFTER MILO'S TINY HOSPITAL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

MILO, MAINE.—The little town of Milo (pop. 2,600) lies in north central Maine, somewhere south of Millinocket and somewhere north of Bangor. The casual traveler is not likely ever to get to Milo unless he has some particular business to attend to, but there's a story here worth a moment of your time.

Unless some new money is found by early February, the town will lose its hospital. All the old money has been exhausted; the bake sale money, the bean supper money, the town tax money—it's all run out. After a small-town struggle that would break your heart, the "big guys" may win after all.

The "big guys" are all those powerful people behind big desks somewhere else—at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, at state agencies down in Augusta, wherever it is the Blue Cross and Blue Shield administrators sit. The "big guys" are the planners and policy-makers.

And Milo is pretty small. Its hospital has nine beds. One is reminded of Daniel Webster's argument in behalf of Dartmouth College—a small institution, but there are those who love it. The hospital in Milo has no such glorious history; it dates only to 1928, when it was established privately in a comfortable old three-story house. In 1960, the town formed a non-profit corporation and took it over.

In the course of time came the big guys with the big programs and the big ideas and the big books of rules and regulations. These factotums, dignitaries and policy-makers are not to be regarded as black-hatted villains; they have not acted as dictators, tyrants or

despots. Obviously, there are a few hard feelings among the Friends of Milo Community Hospital, but the record suggests that the big guys have acted out of a sincere concern for greater efficiency and better medical care.

In any event, the last few years have been a chronicle of one discouraging hassle after another. The hospital trustees were put on notice that the building failed to comply with certain safety standards. Teams of inspectors came and went. Reports were filed, certificates were denied. Finally, in May of last year, it looked as if \$100,000 to \$150,000 would have to be spent if the hospital were to survive.

Such a sum is pocket change in Washington; it is the kind of trivial item that gets rounded off in a decimal point. In Milo, it looked like the national debt. Then the big guys relented: If the top two floors of the old building were lopped off, and if this were done and that were done, at a cost of maybe \$30,000, perhaps a reprieve would be approved.

But the big guys had a bigger and better idea: If Milo would just go along with construction of a 52-bed regional hospital at Dover-Foxcroft, 13 miles away, everything would be solved. The little hospital in Milo could be abandoned. Fine medical care would be assured. It was all friendly, but there was an edge to it: If Milo didn't go along, Milo would lose its Medicare-Medicaid money.

The townspeople held town meetings. Repeatedly they rejected the friendly proposal. Instead, they plunged into renovation with their own hands. They raised \$6,000 the old-fashioned way. And in November, spick and span, the bobtailed little hospital reopened.

Alas, the effort hasn't impressed the big guys behind the big desks. Medicare and Medicaid funds have been withheld. The Blue Cross-Blue Shield people say their contract lapsed while the hospital was closed for renovation. Pressure continues for the big regional institution at Dover-Foxcroft. The trouble with the stubborn people of Milo, it is said, is that they don't know what's good for them.

Well, maybe not. But here is a small town fighting for what its own townspeople, in their own town meeting, say they want to hold onto. That's a principle worth saving, if it takes a billion baked beans to do.

#### THE SONG OF SEVENTY-SIX

#### HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in this, our Bicentennial Year, I think that it is important to encourage the active participation of as many citizens as possible to help celebrate our Nation's birthday.

I am therefore pleased to have received an important contribution to this celebration from a constituent, Mr. Edward Herst of San Francisco.

Mr. Herst has taken the time and effort to compose and copyright the words and music to a Bicentennial song, called "The Song of Seventy Six."

As is the case with any birthday gift, it is the thought that counts. And the thought becomes that much more meaningful when comes from the heart, is offered in the spirit of patriotism, and is given with no thought of private gain.

Mr. Speaker, this is the case with Mr.

Herst. I believe he deserves recognition for his contribution, and the thanks of Members of Congress for his efforts.

The lyrics of "The Song of Seventy Six" follow:

#### THE SONG OF SEVENTY SIX

Imbue us with new faith to dedicate this year.

Instill us with true love to consecrate this year.

The courage and wisdom of our forbears.

Sets an example to us, their heirs.

Rekindle that spirit is what we must do.

With hard work and foresight our goals will come true.

Let's forge on together in seventy six.

Forever the home of the Free.

#### PRIME MINISTER RABIN WELCOMED TO THE UNITED STATES

#### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel to this country and to the Congress. Throughout his distinguished career as a military and political leader, he has justifiably earned the respect and admiration of all people sincerely concerned with insuring the peace of the world. Americans have a particularly good reason to welcome Mr. Rabin because of our memory of the humanity and intelligence he demonstrated during the period in which he served as Israel's Ambassador to the United States.

In his address to the Congress, Mr. Rabin has eloquently outlined the history of Israel. His description is of special importance to all Americans as we celebrate the Bicentennial of our independence. Like Israel, the United States began as a small isolated country whose fight against enormous odds was primarily sustained by a deep conviction in the democratic process. We in the United States are fortunate to be living in a secure, democratic state, but Israel is still fighting for her independence. It is incumbent upon all Americans that we continue to support her efforts to maintain a secure democracy.

Although Mr. Rabin's accomplishments are great in number, none have surpassed his ability to conduct Israeli policy with dignity, even in the face of the scurrilous actions of his neighbors. The Arabs Nations and their allies have acted in a way that demeans not only their own motives but also the world body specifically designed to insure peace, the United Nations. Israel has steadfastly refused to participate in such shameful behavior, and Mr. Rabin's remarks indicate that she will continue to respond to unfair demands with dignity and strength.

Mr. Rabin's address again demonstrates the sincere desire of Israel to find a solution to the problems of Palestinians and others in the Mideast. He has offered to meet face-to-face with the leaders of the Arab world at any time and in any



place. Unfortunately, the Arab leaders have not yet demonstrated an equal willingness to meet and frankly discuss their common problems. The different approaches to peace between the Arab countries and Israel is obvious. When Arab countries have actively pursued or covertly encouraged terrorist activities, Prime Minister Rabin has acted with restraint. When Arab countries have resorted to blackmail and extortion, Mr. Rabin has relied on reason. When Arab countries have viewed international diplomacy as an exercise in bellicosity and force, Mr. Rabin has consistently displayed a readiness to compromise and a sincere desire for peace.

It is sadly true that the State of Israel faces some difficult years ahead, but it should be of considerable solace to all her friends and to all people interested in peace, that her future course is being charted by a person with the skill and judgment of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. It is even more reassuring to hear the prime minister make it clear to the world that there will always be an Israel in the Middle East.

#### WHAT BECAME OF CONGRESSIONAL INTENT?

#### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with our consideration of a new security assistance package, the House International Relations Committee was privileged recently to hear testimony from several senior Government officials who administer the Foreign Assistance Act and the Foreign Military Sales Act. Among others, they included Lt. Gen. Howard M. Fish, Director of the Defense Security Agency of the Department of Defense; Robert H. Nooter, Assistant Administrator for Near East and South Asian Affairs of the Agency for International Development; and Carlyle E. Maw, Under Secretary for Security Assistance of the Department of State.

I had the chance to address to them the concern of many Members that the executive branch has been slighting the expressed intent of Congress that some limits be placed on arms transfers to foreign countries, both in terms of sheer volume and in relation to observance of fundamental standards of human rights. The following excerpts from our exchange reinforce these concerns.

From hearings before the House International Relations Committee, November 12, 1975:

Mr. BONKER. In recent years Congress has attempted to enunciate new policy directions with respect to military sales and military assistance. And throughout these hearings members have referred from time to time to provisions in the Military Sales Act which attempt to develop these new guidelines.

Mr. NOOTER. I would like for you to respond specifically to two sections in the Military Sales Act and tell the committee precisely

what the Administration is doing to carry out the Congressional mandate in this area.

The first is section 5, and I will read through these briefly, but I wish you would note them because I would like to have you provide specific responses.

Section 5: It is the sense of Congress that the President should continue to press forward urgently with his efforts to negotiate with the Soviet Union and other powers a limitation on the arms shipments to the Middle East."

Section 6: "It is the sense of Congress that the President should immediately institute a thorough and comprehensive review of the military aid program of the United States. That the President should take such actions as may be appropriate to initiate multilateral discussions with the major powers on the control of worldwide trade, armament; to commence a general debate in the United Nations with respect to the control of the conventional arms trade and, last, to use the power and prestige of his office to signify the intention of the United States to work actively with all nations to check and control the international sales and distribution of conventional weapons of death and destruction."

Specific responses, please.

Mr. NOOTER. That is out of my bailiwick, Mr. Bonker. General Fish may be able to respond to it in part, and anything else we can try to obtain for you from the Department for the record.

General FISH. In April '55 U.S. delegate to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva tables proposed statements, principles for limiting arms transfers. Response from the committee members representing both selling and buying nations was negative. A Report was made to Congress by State Department. A proposal is being prepared by State for staffing that would convene a U.S. intragovernment working group to study possible incentives and means for further encouragement of foreign governments to participate in international arms control discussion.

Dr. Kissinger has been asked in Congressional hearings where he stands on international arms control effort such as convening a conference and he has consistently said that is something we are prepared to explore.

Mr. BONKER. When Secretary Kissinger appeared before this committee last week he stated four criteria to be considered in the foreign transfer of defense services and equipments. General, are you familiar with the criteria that were established by the Secretary and can you apply them in each instance.

General FISH. We are familiar with those criteria and of course they are those that are used. That is of course what is the great and extent of the threat to the security of the recipient nation; what is U.S. interest in helping preserve that security. What are the nations that are involved in military transfers to the recipient countries.

Now, is the potential and what are the consequences for us if we fail to respond?

Mr. BONKER. I might add that the intent of Congress has been that we should not violate human rights in the distribution of sales of military equipment or arms to these countries.

Why is that not included in his criteria?

General FISH. I don't know why the Secretary did not include that.

From hearings before the House International Relations Committee, November 11, 1975:

Mr. BONKER. With respect to Section 502 (b), to which Mrs. Meyner referred a few moments ago, she said in quoting that section "It is the sense of Congress that except in extraordinary circumstances the President shall substantially reduce or terminate se-

curity assistance whenever it is found that a country violates human rights."

Judging from the information I have seen one can only conclude that Zaire is a repressive government, it is a totalitarian government, and it has been guilty of various charges that I think one can easily interpret as violating human rights.

In your answer to Mrs. Meyner, if I can say this graciously, it just appeared as bureaucratic nonsense. Are there any instances where the President has reduced or terminated security assistance to a country for violating human rights in the context of this section?

Mr. MAW. We have not made any such statement in respect of any country and have not gone further than to say it has been taken into account in arriving at our programs. Our primary question is the assessment of our own national interest and we have avoided making any findings or publicly condemning internal actions.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Maw, excuse me. I was asking for specific instances where we have reduced or terminated security assistance programs to countries who have violated human rights.

Mr. MAW. There is not any instance where we have publicly so stated.

Mr. BONKER. Thank you.

#### TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING ACT

#### HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, Representatives CRANE, PRITCHARD, WAGGONER, and I wrote a letter to our fellow Members in November seeking cosponsors for the Truth in Government Accounting Act, legislation which would require the U.S. Government to prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements utilizing the accrual method of accounting. To date, over 100 Members of Congress have joined us as cosponsors.

In December, the Comptroller General, appearing before Chairman Brooks of the House Government Operations Committee, endorsed the concept and gave a brief report on the implementation of the law which requires Federal departments and agencies to adopt accrual accounting.

Yesterday, before the House Appropriations Committee, Treasury Secretary Simon announced plans to publish a consolidated financial statement for the Federal Government as a whole based on the accrual method of accounting. Treasury has been publishing accrual statements for certain individual agencies since 1956. The target date for the first consolidated statement, according to Secretary Simon, is early 1978.

I applaud the decision of the Secretary and commend him for his initiative.

However, I believe that Congress should proceed with consideration of the Truth in Government Accounting Act in the spirit of the recent initiatives of Congress to develop a greater responsibility for—the formulation and control of the budget of the Federal Government. The implementation of a consoli-

dated financial statement based on accrual methods of accounting should be a joint Executive-congressional project.

I urge my colleagues who have not done so to join as cosponsors of the Truth in Government Accounting Act—for it is essential that we develop the tools we need to analyze and evaluate the long-range impact of all programs and policies of the Federal Government. If we limit our efforts to an examination of annual budgets comprising receipts and expenditures, congressional budget reform is mere window dressing, in spite of all the rhetoric to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert excerpts from Secretary Simon's testimony in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues will have the opportunity to review his excellent statement in support of this important concept:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SIMON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, JANUARY 27 AND 28, 1976

The balancing of the Federal budget by FY 1979 would have a favorable impact on the future development of the U.S. economy. Because of the cumulative nature of government spending programs over the years, decisions made during this budget-planning period will largely determine whether or not we will achieve responsible fiscal policy goals in the future. Thus, the long-term impact of current policy decisions should be the basis for all of our economic planning.

There can be confusion about what is necessary to deal with a current problem and the effect of that action on future fiscal flexibility. Too often we in government are prone to make decisions without proper consideration of the cumulative impact of those decisions on the future. To deal with this problem, I am proposing that government accounting be placed on an accrual basis where unfunded liabilities are fully recognized. This would thwart the natural tendency for those at all levels of government to want to claim revenues too early and expenditures too late, thereby postponing the day of reckoning. We have had recent examples of the sharp and painful adjustments that must occur to a local government when things are continually swept under the rug until eventually the rug will cover no more. With each sweeping, future fiscal flexibility is curtailed one more notch. Eventually a government has no flexibility to deal with current problems. The same thing occurs for the Federal government, except the rug can be stretched for a while because, after all the Federal government prints the money.

The Treasury has been publishing accrual statements for certain individual agencies since 1956 and we now plan to do this on a consolidated basis for the Federal government as a whole. Our target date for the first of these publications—for the Fiscal Year ending September 30, 1977—is early in 1978. I would emphasize that the initial publication will focus on significant accruals that have a major impact on the overall financial condition and operating results of the Federal government. The first set of statements are likely to be accompanied by extensive qualifications. As the reporting process and statement preparation procedures are improved, however, these qualifications will diminish.

Not only will the reader obtain a consolidated financial view of the Federal government but an idea of the magnitude of all liabilities, whether they be funded or unfunded and whether they be due for payment in the near future or the distant future. In these consolidated statements, revenues will

be recognized only when they are earned and sure to be collected and expenditures will be recognized no later than the time the liability to pay them is firmly established. We believe that this will bring more responsible accounting to government. Financial problems will surface long before a crisis is imminent, thereby reducing unpleasant surprises. I believe this will permit more reasoned judgments on decisions which impact the future fiscal flexibility of our nation. Our children should not bear the albatross of paying for the excesses of this generation, while their government is unable to cope with problems because it lacks fiscal flexibility.

I realize that this committee has been concerned in the past about the cost of installing elaborate accrual accounting systems in agencies where the need is not clearly established. I want to assure you that I am not advocating a slavish application of textbook accounting to every agency and appropriation without regard to benefits. All Federal agencies have accrual accounting of some sort. What we intend to do is to supplement the data we already have with some missing pieces of major proportions, and by major I mean in terms of governmentwide magnitudes, not individual appropriations.

I also want to say that I am not proposing a change in the basis for calculating the official budget surplus or deficit, or in the manner of justifying appropriations. There are some who advocate accrual accounting for both of those purposes, but I do not want to let the controversy over those applications interfere with my objective of giving the American people a clear business-like disclosure of the overall financial condition of their Government.

#### FAMILY FARMS

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have long been an advocate of Government policy which promotes the economic health of dairy farming—especially family dairy farming. I was delighted that the Congress last month took a step in that direction by passing a bill to raise milk price supports to 85 percent of parity and institute quarterly adjustments. That bill is still sitting on President's Ford's desk and if he chooses to veto it, I intend to be in the forefront of the override effort.

As I have noted many times before, I represent far more consumers than dairy farmers, and some of my consumer constituents have a hard time understanding why I am so committed to dairy issues. In fact, many of them consider me an alarmist and believe that I am crying wolf when I talk about the way production costs are outstripping the prices farmers receive for their milk. "How in the world can any dairy farmer stay in business," they ask, "if his production costs are consistently higher than his income?"

The answer to that question lies in part in the way many farmers are forced to exploit the labor of their wives and children. It is not uncommon for a farmer's wife to put in longer, tougher hours than most men in other walks of life, or

for children as young as 8 or 10 to operate heavy farm machinery. Most family farmers are able to stay in business only by putting the entire family to work and if they had to pay for all the labor their wives and children supply, they simply could not make it.

The Milwaukee Journal recently published an article by Reporter David Skoloda which explains just how much most dairy farmers depend on family labor and I insert it in the RECORD:

#### CHILDREN OFTEN DOUBLE AS FARMHANDS

(By David M. Skoloda)

TAYLOR, Wis.—The farmer was misty eyed as he faced four congressmen at a Wisconsin public hearing recently and poured out his story of frustration.

"The children are so tired they can hardly keep their eyes open—getting up early to help with the chores," he said.

Yet even with their help, the farm wasn't doing well, he said. For what purpose, then, had he worked his children so hard? he asked himself.

Another farmer said: "I've been on the farm 33 years and worked the hell out of my wife and kids and I finally got the farm paid off."

Thus did two of the many farmers who testified at the dairy hearings acknowledge the important role that children play on many of the state farms. Family labor has long given the farm an edge over operations that must hire labor.

Nationally, there are now about 3,005,000 family workers on farms, compared with 1,250,000 hired workers.

One of these family workers is Mark Simonson, 10, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Simonson of Taylor. Mark and his parents, along with Cathy, 13, Deborah, 8, Michael 5, and Tammie, 4, live on a scenic ridge six miles south of Taylor in Jackson County. The long, narrow road to their farm rises sharply though the wooded hillside and then emerges on the top.

The land drops sharply away on either side of the house and barn, and half of the 410 acres that Simonson works are steep and dotted with stands of woods.

In summer, the tillable slopes are carefully planted in strips along the contour of the land to slow the rush of water and loss of soil. It was on these slopes that Simonson, now 35, learned to farm.

He recalls that when he was 5, he was driving a tractor and tipped over a wagon on the steep slopes. No one was hurt and the incident has not deterred him from having his son operate the farm equipment.

Now, 10 year old Mark is learning on the land.

"He handles the tractors, and this summer he unloaded most of the chopper wagons, his father said. "We try to watch where he's going to work and don't let him go on the terribly steep land."

[Tractor accidents in which children are victims are a constant worry for farm families. The state's Bureau of Health Statistics says that an average of 20 children aged 14 and younger were killed in farm accidents each year from 1968 to 1972, and about one-third to one-half were in tractor accidents.

[Another source, Donald Jensen, University of Wisconsin Extension safety specialist, reports that in 1974 there were 21 farm fatalities of people 21 and younger, and about half were tractor accidents. Jensen did an accident analysis of some 3,000 farm families in 21 counties in 1969 and found that 24% of the accidents were in the age group 5 to 14.]

Mark shares the chores with Cathy and Deborah, rotating the morning and evening assignments and working with them on weekends. Deborah feeds the calves, Mark



and Cathy change off working in the pit between the lines of cattle being milked. They wash and wipe the cows' udders and help their father determine when the animals have been milked out.

"I do feel that the children have a greater opportunity for responsibility out here," Simonson said. "Not just because of the jobs being available, but because of the necessity of them having to be done. If we were to hire all the help our children give us, we couldn't farm."

The Taylor farmer added:

"We see young families that struggle to make a go of it on the farm. About the time the kids are old enough to give a lot of help, that's when they get over the hump and out of a financial bind."

While many farm families place top priority on the farm work, the Simonsons say they also see to it that their children have the opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities.

Cathy, an eighth grader, has a penchant for sneaking a book to bed with a flashlight, her mother says. Cathy also plays the piano and flute and is in the school jazz band. And she is an accompanist for the school chorus.

#### PRIVILEGE—AND RESPONSIBILITY

"One thing I stress; with the privilege of doing something special goes the responsibility to help at home, and that may mean a change in schedule," Mrs. Simonson said.

"If Cathy is on for chores in the evening this week (they change off every other week), and they have jazz band tomorrow night, she may have to negotiate and be nice to Mark so he will say 'Yes, Cathy.'"

"They're having to learn to work with other people."

The Simonsons know that it won't be long before they will be turning their children out into the world.

"We have to get our values across to them now," she said.

That's why the family is trying to do more things together.

For example, the family is sharing time together looking over a new encyclopedia set recently purchased.

The family is crowded into the old farmhouse and the furnishings are worn. The Simonsons acknowledge that money has been a problem.

#### "WE WOULDN'T TAKE IT"

"Most of us out here qualify for food stamps and free lunches at school, but we wouldn't take it," Mrs. Simonson said. "We really have mixed feelings about qualifying but not participating. We feel it is not setting a good example for the children."

They explained that they have had difficulty recovering financially from the rebuilding necessary after a barn fire.

But, they added, milk prices have improved recently.

"There should definitely be a future on the farm for us," Simonson said. "We certainly want to farm. It is in our heart to stay."

In addition to her many duties, Mrs. Simonson has a business of her own—selling women's underclothing. The family also cares for a cemetery.

The cemetery money goes into a vacation fund. Last summer, the family traveled to Wisconsin Dells, Milwaukee's Zoo and then up to Kewaunee and Sturgeon Bay for some fishing and cherry picking.

They brought back 61 pounds of cherries and 150 pounds of fish.

Mrs. Simonson told the congressional dairy hearing in West Salem that the fringe benefits of farming were having responsible children and a family working and living together close to nature.

"Our families do not want welfare, but to stay on the land and have a future there," she said.

#### THE BECHTEL CASE

### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the past several months have brought revelation after revelation concerning the Arab boycott of Israel. Incidents have come to light which indicate U.S. participation in the boycott, both in the private and public sectors. There is no question but that this participation in discriminatory practices by U.S. companies is immoral.

Now the Justice Department, in its recently filed suit against Bechtel Corp., has decided that this involvement in the boycott is also illegal. Because of the importance of this issue, I am including a copy of an excellent editorial by the Washington Post on the Bechtel case:

#### THE BOYCOTT ISSUE

A major battle of principle and policy has been joined by the Justice Department's civil suit charging the San Francisco-based Bechtel Corporation with supporting the Arab boycott of Israel. Justice's contention is that the huge heavy-construction firm, by refusing to deal with blacklisted subcontractors and by requiring subcontractors in general to refuse to deal with blacklisted companies, is in violation of American antitrust law. The State Department tried unsuccessfully to block the suit, privately but urgently protesting that even its filing risked alienating the diplomatic favor of, in particular, Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia is at once the bulwark of the boycott and a country whose cooperation is considered vital to American diplomacy, not to speak of American oil supplies. In the Treasury and Commerce Departments, moreover, and in the business constituencies they represent, fear was and is rampant that the suit will cost American companies billions of dollars worth of potential business throughout the Arab world.

We find it undeniable, nonetheless, that Justice was right to go ahead and file the suit. Nothing in the antitrust law reserves its application to situations which don't make foreign waves. In the Export Administration Act of 1969, moreover, it was declared to be "the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States." Whether Bechtel is in fact guilty of antitrust violations, we leave, of course, to the courts. But it is noteworthy that Bechtel responded to the suit not by denying the charges but by contending—evidently in reference to certain procedures of the Commerce Department—that "federal regulations and printed forms and statements . . . have expressly stated that compliance with (the boycott) is not illegal under American law." The corporation added that its Arab business is conducted "in areas and in ways compatible with U.S. foreign policy goals."

We sense here the development, within the U.S. government and within the larger political community, of another of those difficult issues that have made the conduct of American public life so bitter in recent years. The difference in this case lies in the fact that the challenge to the administration's economic habit and foreign policy comes from its own Justice Department, supported, to be sure, by a probable majority in Congress.

This puts a special burden on the State Department—a burden so far inadequately

appreciated. For the Department's emphasis has been to complain that Justice and Congress were complicating the making of foreign policy. What the Department should be doing, however, is telling the United States' Arab friends that a deepening longterm relationship is only possible on the basis of mutual respect. That Arab league states conduct their own trade boycott against Israel is their business—regrettable to Americans but something that the United States, which has conducted its own politically motivated boycotts, is in a poor position to protest. That Arab states should expect to enlist American firms to support the Arab boycott, is however, very different. The issue is that simple.

The court proceeding is likely to be long and drawn out. This may provide the time and the extra pressure needed for the boycott issue to be worked out on a political basis between the United States and the various Arab governments. We hope so. The suit, if so used by American diplomats, could help Arab officials understand that they cannot properly expect to entangle American businesses in their fight with Israel. And it could bring an end to a situation—American participation in the boycott—which is a standing reproach to the values of the United States.

#### DISABILITY PAYMENTS

### HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share with my colleagues part five of the Chicago Tribune series on the Veterans' Administration. This article, from the January 22 paper, focuses on disability payments:

#### VETS' DISABILITY PAY A COMBAT ZONE

(By James Coates)

Last year the American public paid more than \$3.7 billion in monthly payments of between \$35 and \$1,028 to 2.2 million veterans for disabilities they received during military service.

Not surprisingly, the emotion-laden compensation program is continually embroiled in controversy, as some badly wounded veterans claim they are not getting enough money, some critics charge that many veterans are overcompensated, and others contend that aspects of the system are inequitable.

"President Kennedy [injured in World War II] still got compensation even when he was in the White House," a local Veterans Administration official noted in explaining Congress' intent to pay compensation without consideration of a veteran's other sources of income or whether his disability affects his work.

A five-year, \$1.3-million VA study published in 1973 showed that the 30-year-old manual used for evaluating disabilities is outdated and fails to account for many medical advances. The result, the study says, is that many veterans—particularly those who are getting paid for minor disabilities not related to combat—are getting paid too much.

Another study, by the Paralyzed Veterans of America, shows that a special "aid and attendance" allowance of an additional \$489 a month for severely crippled veterans falls far short of the average \$1,649 such disabilities require for special care.

Beyond these thorny questions of public policy, which are debated almost annually in Congress, lies a thicket of bureaucratic

regulations and complex medical considerations that often stands between the veteran and his compensation.

"Talking to the VA is like talking to a wall," complains Allan Spector, 58, who has been trying for several years to get increased compensation for a back injury he sustained in World War II.

Spector has become enmeshed in the difficult rating process for disabilities, in which every veteran who claims to have become injured or diseased during service is assigned a percentage of disability from 0 to 100, in 10 per cent increments.

The disability ratings are made according to a detailed rating schedule, which lists most maladies known to man, from flat feet (0 to 50 percent, depending on the severity), to amputation of the leg at the thigh (60 to 90 per cent), to epilepsy (10 to 100 per cent).

The manual also rates such things as ulcers, heart problems, hemorrhoids, and asthma. All such disabilities must be shown to have first occurred during service. The law and the VA make no distinction between combat and non-combat disabilities.

Spector applied for his rating increase to one of the three-man rating boards in the Chicago regional office. The boards make their decisions on the basis of a veteran's military records, his own doctor's reports, and usually an examination by VA doctors.

Although Spector says the injury often confines him to a wheelchair, the board refused to increase his rating above the minimum 10 per cent. "I can't understand it," Spector said. "My neighbors feel sorry for me; they know I used to be able to walk good. How can the VA say I'm only 10 per cent disabled?"

The 10 per cent rating entitles Spector to \$35 monthly as set by Congress. The monthly payments increase to \$655 for 100 per cent disabilities, plus additional awards for amputation and blindness, which could push the total monthly benefit to \$1,628.

Spector said the VA never told him that its doctors don't think his back injury is as severe as he claims, the explanation found in VA records. They agree he is sick, but they believe most of his problems are not "service connected."

Other veterans also complained to The Tribune that the biggest problem with the compensation program is fighting the red tape and onslaught of form letters.

"I worked 10 hours to put together all the documents for my case, and all they gave me was a two-line answer," fumed Leonard Wislow, who was denied compensation for a wrist injury he says he suffered at reserve training camp.

An examination by The Tribune of several veterans' files confirmed that the VA form letter—often sent after months of waiting for a decision—is disappointingly brief. The VA counters that a more complete explanation is available upon request.

Chicago Regional VA Director Claude Gilliam said, "It is not a case of our being unwilling to give the veteran more information. But we don't have the luxury [of time and money] available in every case."

Figures from the Board of Veterans Appeals in Washington, which handles claims from disgruntled veterans in all the VA's myriad programs, attest to the complexity of compensation. Three-fourths of the caseload concerns the disability compensation program alone.

Despite the complexity of compensation cases, the VA is insulated from challenge by outsiders. The Tribune found, and veterans are denied rights given applicants for nearly all other government programs.

One unique law says decisions by the VA are "final and conclusive and no other official or any court" can review them. In other words, the veteran may not sue the VA if he thinks he's being cheated. In nearly all other federal programs, including Social

Security and welfare, the applicant's last resort is a court.

It is nearly impossible for the veteran to hire a lawyer to represent him before the VA's administrative hearings because another law limits a lawyer's fee for a VA case to \$10. Social Security allows an applicant to pay up to 25 per cent of the award to the lawyer who helped him get it.

The VA counters that lawyers aren't necessary because the major veterans organizations provide representation [though usually not lawyers] free of charge. Calvin Young of Winfield has such a representative and he complains, "The VFW (Veterans of Foreign Wars) hardly knows anything about my case. They seem to have a lackadaisical attitude."

Another problem is that the head of the VA is required periodically to revise and update the disability rating schedule. But few administrators have dared tamper with it.

So, the VA now uses the same schedule it used in 1945, which fails to account for the great changes in medicine and rehabilitation that have occurred since then.

A 1973 attempt to issue a new disability schedule was beaten back by the powerful veterans organizations in a firestorm of protest. They argued that its proposed reductions in ratings would have created Viet Nam veterans.

The proposed 1973 schedule also would have increased some ratings, particularly for several chronically underrated psychological disabilities. VA Administrator Richard Roudebush has pushed through one set of changes along these lines, and says another set is in the work. His changes recognize such medical advances as heart pacemakers and artificial hip joints.

When those are implemented later this year, "then I think we'll have a modern rating schedule that will be responsive to the needs of veterans," he said.

None of Roudebush's changes involves decreases in ratings and, not surprisingly, they have gotten "excellent reception from both Congress and the veterans organizations."

#### VA PENSIONS "REDUNDANT"

(By James Coates)

Even the Veterans Administration's critics agree that there is a need for paying disability compensation to veterans injured in service.

But paying veterans pensions is another matter.

"The doubling of Social Security benefit levels from 1965 to 1974 and the enactment of Supplemental Security payments recently has made VA pensions virtually redundant," said Michael March, a professor of public affairs at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

The pension program currently provides monthly payments of up to \$173 for a single veteran who served during a war period and whose income is \$3,300 or less, and up to \$186 for a couple earning less than \$4,500. Pensions are strictly limited by a Veteran's income.

The 2.2 million veterans and survivors who qualify for pensions by being either over 65 or totally and permanently disabled, got about \$2.7 billion last year.

Most pensioners are old and poor [although they include about 8,000 Viet Nam veterans who suffered accidents after they left the service]. But since the 1930s, other federal programs have arisen to help such people, veterans or not. Some critics say it is time to phase out VA pensions.

"I'm not so sure that a guy who spent 90 days picking up cigaret butts for the Army during the war is entitled to special treatment," said Olney Owen, a former chief benefits director of the VA who is a strong advocate of most of its programs for veterans.

Veterans groups have staunchly defended the program, arguing in part that anyone

who ever served his country should never have to resort to "welfare."

But Government policy planners are worried about the threat to the budget that pensions may pose in the near future, as the bulk of World War II veterans approach 65.

Colorado's Prof. March, a former senior staffer with the Federal Office of Management and Budget, calculates that at current inflation rates, with no changes in the law, the pension program would in just 15 years surpass today's entire \$16-billion VA budget, and would top \$26 billion by the year 2000.

Even Sen. Vance Hartke [D., Ind.] a firm believer in the principle of VA pensions, fears that without changes skyrocketing pension costs could "result in federal expenditures which would become increasingly illogical and difficult to defend."

Hartke has introduced legislation to re-vamp and simplify the pension system, in part to iron out irregularities that have crept in as Congress has made piecemeal changes over the years. He estimates the reform package would cost an extra \$1 billion annually at the outset, but that over the long term it will make it easier to defend pensions "against the attacks of those who would abolish veterans pensions altogether."

Some critics would rather see VA pensions combined with Social Security and Supplemental Security into a single, coherent system that would eliminate needless administrative duplication and assure fair treatment for all.

But so strident is the opposition by veterans groups to anything that smacks of welfare, a study by the 20th Century Fund notes wryly, that the political problems could perhaps be solved "only by making every needy individual an honorary 'veteran.'"

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FRANCISCAN MISSIONARIES OF MARY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, St. Francis' Hospital is well known to the residents of the Sixth Congressional District, including my small grandson who has gone there with the usual cuts and bruises and received outstanding care. I have long been impressed by not only the fine facilities, but by the compassionate treatment offered by the sisters who operate the hospital. I would like to join the many other friends of this excellent hospital, in congratulating the sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary on 100 years of loving service provided the world over.

The beginning of the 100th anniversary year of the sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary was celebrated by the Board of Directors of St. Francis Hospital on Sunday, January 18, with a solemn concelebrated mass at St. Mary's Church, Manhasset, and a reception at the hospital's St. Clare's Pavilion.

The board, besides honoring the sisters on their Centennial Year, is taking the opportunity to thank the sisters for more than 55 years of service and love for Long Islanders through their work at St. Francis in Roslyn. The sisters were presented with a specially designed flag to be flown at the hospital during the Centennial Year.



The Institute of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary was founded in India on January 6, 1877, by a Breton, Helen de Chappotin, who took the name Mother Mary of Passion. The order has now grown to an international congregation of religious women in some 66 nations, where the sisters are involved in education, social work, health care, and pastoral ministries.

The sisters' apostolate at St. Francis Hospital began in 1920 as a camp for underprivileged children on land donated by a Quaker, Carlos Munson. St. Francis later developed into a convalescent hospital for children with rheumatic heart disease, then into a world renowned center for heart surgery on children, and now into a cardiac specialty hospital with general care beds, serving adults as well as children.

The mass and reception on January 18 was the first in a series of events planned for the coming year to highlight the work of the sisters, both at St. Francis and around the world. Three major symposiums with outstanding guest speakers are currently being planned for 1976 to highlight the role of the religious in the health care apostolate.

My sincere thanks and congratulations are added to those of the many people who have been helped by the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary in their century long history of aid to humanity.

#### NORMAN COUSINS CALLS FORCED BUSING A FAILURE

#### HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday Review for January 24 carries a fine editorial by Editor Norman Cousins entitled, "Busing Reconsidered." Every Member of this body could read it with profit.

Mr. Cousins, long a leading liberal spokesman, states flatly—

Busing hasn't desegregated the schools. It has re-segregated them.

Advocating a White House conference to search out alternatives, Mr. Cousins concludes his editorial with a sensible comment that Congress should heed:

There is no disgrace in having failed in an important social enterprise. The only disgrace is in persisting with failure in order to hold the commitments without regard to the need for keeping an open mind.

The full text of the editorial follows:

#### BUSING RECONSIDERED

Busing was honestly conceived as a way of coping with the fact that schools in predominantly black neighborhoods were segregated as the result of local geography. The effect of this circumstantial segregation, it was believed at the time, was to lower standards of education for blacks.

But busing hasn't worked. After almost a decade, it seems clear that the principal mistake was to assume that we could create a more socially responsible society by putting the problem on wheels and expecting it to arrive at a daily solution. The evidence is

substantial that busing is leading away from integration and not toward it; that it has not significantly improved the quality of education accessible to blacks; that it has lowered the standard of education available to whites; that it has resulted in the exodus of white students to private schools inside the city or to public schools in the comparatively affluent suburbs beyond the economic means of blacks; and, finally, that it has not contributed to racial harmony but has produced deep fissures within American society.

Busing hasn't desegregated the schools. It has re-segregated them. Racial concentration, the core of the problem, continues. Some 30 percent of white families have moved to the suburbs, leaving many large northern cities with predominantly black schools. For example, in Washington, D.C., 96 percent of the students are black; in Newark, N.J., 72 percent; in Detroit, 70 percent; in Philadelphia, 61 percent; in Chicago, 58 percent; in Cleveland, 57 percent. Does this mean that we must now borrow white students from the suburbs and bus them back to the inner city?

The document that is generally regarded as having provided the impetus for school busing is the 1966 report titled "Equality of Educational Opportunity." It was written by James S. Coleman, professor of sociology, University of Chicago, under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education. Coleman's research showed that deprived students did better when their schoolmates came from backgrounds strong in educational motivation. The general interpretation placed on the Coleman Report was that the practice of segregation had resulted in inferior education for blacks. The conclusion at the time was that putting blacks into white classes offered the best chance of meeting that problem.

Professor Coleman has recently completed a second report. He now presents his somber conclusion that busing has had the effect of replacing old patterns of segregation with new ones. "Ironically," he writes, "desegregation may be increasing segregation." He reaffirms the need for ensuring equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment, but he believes it is irresponsible to ignore or stand aside from the effects of measures taken for that purpose. "The achievement benefits of integrated schools appeared substantial when I studied them in the middle 1960s," he says, "but subsequent studies of achievement in actual systems that have desegregated, some with a more rigorous methodology than we were able to use in 1966, have found smaller effects, and in some cases none at all."

A major error in the original decision was to underestimate the extent to which family background is a controlling factor in education. Parents who are poorly educated themselves and who have to contend with prolonged joblessness, overcrowding, and malnutrition cannot reasonably be expected to create a home atmosphere supportive of a learning experience for their children.

What is happening is that we are bypassing the fundamentals in the search for an answer. It is the condition of the black in America that continues to be the central, overriding, and saturating issue. Everything involved in lifting a people out of their low estate in society—housing, health, economic opportunity, nutrition, access to justice under the law—fits into this total challenge.

The first thing that has to be done is to de-politicize the issue. By this time, busing has become a battleground for liberals and conservatives. There appears to be a feeling among many liberals that to oppose busing is to renounce an essential commitment to a better life for blacks. Many conservatives feel that the busing program is proof positive of the hazards of severe gov-

ernmental intrusion in matters involving racial and social injustice.

What is needed is a White House Conference for the purpose of making an objective analysis of the busing experience and for proposing alternatives.

It is to be hoped that the persons invited to such a conference would come from many professions and occupations, and not from education alone.

There is no disgrace in having failed in an important social enterprise. The only disgrace is in persisting with failure in order to hold to commitments without regard to the need for keeping an open mind. A country dedicated to human rights should not have to confess intellectual and moral bankruptcy in attempting to provide an adequate education for all its citizens.

#### STARLING AND BLACKBIRD CONTROL

#### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues of a letter which was sent to the President by me and the ranking minority member of my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, the Honorable EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, on Wednesday, January 28, regarding H.R. 11510, a bill to provide for starling and blackbird control in Kentucky and Tennessee, which passed both Houses of Congress on Tuesday, January 27.

As set forth in this letter, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment will hold a hearing on this subject on Monday, February 2, 1976, at 10 a.m. in room 1334 of the Longworth House Office Building. Anyone wishing to present testimony should notify the subcommittee office at 225-7307.

The text of the letter to the President follows:

JANUARY 28, 1976.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,  
President of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: H.R. 11510, a bill to provide for emergency starling and blackbird control in Kentucky and Tennessee, passed both Houses of Congress yesterday and has been sent to you for signature.

Because the bill was presented as an emergency measure, it passed the House by unanimous consent request without the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee and without consideration by our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment as well as the Full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which has jurisdiction over the matters involved. Likewise, the other Body acted on the legislation unanimously, by voice vote, without hearings. Due to the nature of the legislation, particularly the provision which exempts actions taken thereunder from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, many interested citizens and organizations with specific knowledge of the matters involved have requested an opportunity to present relevant testimony regarding the situation with which H.R. 11510 is designed to deal.

In view of our Subcommittee's oversight responsibilities and the continuing nature of the starling and blackbird problem which

may require a more permanent solution, we have scheduled a hearing for 10:00 a.m. on Monday, February 2, to listen to all available evidence on the matters involved.

We are sure that you will want to have the benefit of this information as well. Accordingly, an analysis of the testimony presented at the hearing will be prepared and provided to you before the end of next week, which information should assist you in evaluating the merits of the legislation.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

EDWIN B. FORSYTHE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries  
and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment.

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,  
Ranking Minority Member.

### THE PASSING OF RALPH CLINE, "THE PATRIOT"

#### HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 26, Ralph Cline, a man who epitomized the spirit and tenacity of a true American, passed away. His face has been immortalized by the noted American artist, Andrew Wyeth, in a portrait entitled "The Patriot." The real Ralph Cline, however, will be immortalized by the lasting effect his character and indomitable spirit has had on all who have known him. It is truly sad to note the passing of a man who many of us assumed would continue like the eagle to serve as a living symbol of the pride we all have in our Nation.

As one who knew him, I feel compelled to share two articles which appeared on January 27 in the *Courier Gazette* of Rockland, Maine. These articles do much to accurately describe the spirit and dignity of a man known simply as "The Patriot."

The articles follow:

#### A MAN OF STRONG CHARACTER (By Pat Mitchell)

They are blowing Taps now for Ralph Cline, signaling the end of the man, the passing of his era.

Withal, *The Patriot* will be remembered.

Like that time in the Augusta State Armory, when the bureaucrats and politicians decided that some sort of a public hearing was appropriate to the passage of a stiff gun control bill.

That meeting was originally scheduled for a small room in the new State Office Building. But, the hue and cry was such as to influence the government types that a larger room was needed to handle the expected hundred or so citizens who would attend. Then, as the clamor against such legislation grew, the bureaucrats finally decided on the Armory as a hearing room, a decision much heeded by the high-profile politicians who calculated that with a big crowd coming, their appearance was mandatory.

Ralph and this scribe showed up just a few minutes before the session formally began. The stage, the speaker's podium, the politicians were flood lit from front, top and sides. The press photographers and the TV camera men were at work. The politicians basked in their spotlight glory . . . until Ralph

quietly walked into the room, unannounced. Lean, tall, stooped a little with his age, he walked down the center aisle, looking for a spare seat amidst the crowd of 2,500 citizens. As he strode, and Ralph always strode, he was recognized. Like a wave rolling to the beach, to crash with dramatic violence on the sands, a rolling wave of men, coming to their feet, paced Ralph's progress up that center aisle.

The photographers and TV men swung lenses away from the politicians and their satraps. Ralph hit the front line of chairs and an Armory full of men, all on their feet, applauded with a rising crescendo of approval for *The Patriot*.

Later in the session, while giving his testimony to the Legislative Commission, he was asked why he appeared.

He answered, "Gentlemen, there is an old enlisted man's credo to the effect that if you don't exercise your rights, you lose your rights. I'm an enlisted man (Cline was a heavy machine gun section sergeant in World War One) and I'm sure as hell exercising my rights."

Or that time when down at Cline's mill in the Spruce Head section of the Town of St. George, when a scribe dropped in, searching for a feature story.

As the journalist swung his Great White Beast into the mill yard, Cline was observed to be dusting his coveralls clean of sawdust and re-arranging the shoulder straps.

"What happened, Ralph?"

"Well," said the 75 year old Patriot, "I was about to run that big oak log through the saw when I slipped and it slipped and I wound up under the log, with the machinery going and the carriage sort of slipping toward that spinning saw."

"How much does that oak log weigh?"

"As a guess, 700 or 800 pounds."

"How'd you get out?"

"Amazing what a man can do when he has to."

It was a flat, matter-of-fact statement, quite typical of the man. He was not shaking, as lesser men might have been in such a perilous situation. Instead, Ralph asked the scribe, who was something of a gun nut, if he happened to have a certain piece with him in the Beast. He did and it was a .45-70, Trapdoor Springfield, a single short military weapon of the late 19th Century, firing a 450 grain slug, the only weapon ever designed to shoot a horse at 1,000 yards. All of which minutiae is so dear to the hearts of gun nuts, and Ralph was one of those, too.

"Got any shells for the old beauty." The scribe did.

"Well, then," said Cline, as he loaded a round, "you see that there knot in the far spruce tree?" He pointed to a tree about 60 yards distant.

Then he fired, off-hand, and splintered the knot. Not bad for old eyes, a ten pound rifle held off-hand, less than a minute after what to many, if not most, men would have been an unnerving experience.

So, they are blowing taps for Ralph Cline. But, the echoes of that final bugle all roll on yet awhile.

#### RALPH CLINE, "THE PATRIOT," DIES (By John Hammer)

His stiff, stern march, his curt and erect salute, and his compassionate Yankee-featured face will be seen no more, yet they will continue to be immortalized in the museums, galleries, and in the memories of those who knew him.

The Patriot, Ralph E. Cline of Spruce Head, is dead.

His passing Monday morning seems to strike many as a shock, as if the regimental, symbolic figure of such a man could never leave them. For year after year, Ralph would

fastidiously dress in his World War I uniform and lead local parade units through Thomaston, at the Fourth of July celebration, in Rockland, during the Maine Seafoods Festival parade, and, as often as possible, in his home town of St. George for the traditional American celebrations.

It was not just the local folks, or those area visitors who witnessed his touching, prideful stride ahead of all of the parade units . . . his deep set eyes and weathered features have been seen throughout the country, as the subject of one of artist Andrew Wyeth's most noted portraits, "The Patriot." His dutiful appearances in the local parades have been covered by state and national television, his character and features have been captured in numerous journals, from local newspapers to the pages of *Life Magazine*.

To many, there was within this seemingly immortal statue of a soldier, a venerable tribute to the Maine Yankee image. There, to those who knew him well or just in passing, was an image of a man who worked his own land, founded and attended every day to his own lumber mill business, and took an active interest in the affairs of his neighbors and his home town.

You only had to meet Ralph Cline once to have the picture of a proud veteran etched in your mind. He was more than a symbol of some such all-inclusive term as "patriotism," he was a vestige to those who served in World War I and the conflicts of later eras.

As word of Ralph Cline's death circulated among local journalists, many who had talked to or photographed the lifelong Spruce Head resident on at least one occasion, the pensive looks and recollections of these first meetings seemed to reflect just how deep a loss the area must endure.

And to those who lived and talked with Cline as a friend and neighbor, perhaps shared a joke with him about the weather over the counter at Farmer's store, and who knew his personal manner and character to be what it was, the loss goes deeper.

Ralph E. Cline, Sr., 80, husband of Miriam Crockett Cline, died Monday at Togus VA Hospital.

A native of Rockland, he was born on March 19, 1894, the son of Melvin and Ella Rackliff Cline.

For many years, he operated the Ralph E. Cline and Son Sawmill in Spruce Head. He was a 70 year member of the First Baptist Church of St. George. He was a charter and life member of Rockland Memorial Post VFW; a charter and life member of Kinney-Melquist Post, American Legion, St. George; an honorary member of Boy Scout Troop 246, St. George; a member of Eureka Lodge of Masons, Tenants Harbor and Naomi Chapter, OES.

During World War I, he formed a unit of State Guard Reserve, known as Cline's Hellcats, and patrolled the shores of Spruce Head.

He was well known as a marcher in Fourth of July parades, marching in each of Thomaston's since 1923. In 1968, he served as marshal for the 22nd annual Maine Seafoods Festival Parade in Rockland.

Besides his widow of Spruce Head, Mr. Cline is survived by one son, Ralph E., Jr., Spruce Head; two daughters, Mrs. Olive Elliott of Standish and Mrs. Miriam Linscott of Thomaston; two sisters, Mrs. Viola Olsen, Gig Harbor, Wash. and Mrs. Mildred Elwell of Unity; 9 grandchildren; and several nieces and nephews.

Funeral services will be Thursday, 2 p.m., at the Wiley's Corner First Baptist Church of St. George, the Rev. Lewis Gesner, Jr. officiating, and with military honors by Kinney-Melquist Post, A.L. Interment will be at the Forest Hill Cemetery, Spruce Head.

Friends may call at the Burpee Funeral Home, 7 to 9 p.m. Wednesday.



# CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED ON STRIP MINING IN OUR NA- TIONAL PARKS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been several months since the Congress was alerted to the fact that there has been an upsurge of strip mining in, of all places, our national parks. The public outcry was obviously against such actions, and the two congressional interior committees demonstrated their own concern by the speed in which they held hearings. Prior to the December recess it appeared that corrective legislation, legislation that would prevent strip mining in our national parks, would be passed. I still think this will happen, but as long as the law remains unchanged, strip mining will continue in our national parks. I would urge the House and Senate Interior Committees to take swift action on the legislation now before them, before more of our common national heritage is desecrated.

One of the leaders in the effort to stop the current upsurge of strip mining is Senator ALAN CRANSTON, who is well known for his concern for our natural resources. Senator CRANSTON recently wrote an article which appeared in the January issue of the *Environmental Journal*, which is a publication of the National Parks and Conservation Association, which describes what the strip mining is doing to just one National Monument, Death Valley.

The article follows:

THE BATTLE FOR DEATH VALLEY—DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL MONUMENT MUST BE PROTECTED FROM MINING

(By Alan Cranston)

It was early morning in Death Valley, barely sunup, and already the fierce desert heat had pushed the temperature over one hundred degrees. Khaki-clad mining engineers parked their trucks at Zabriskie Point scenic overlook beside California Highway 190 and began unloading wooden claim stakes. The men were employees of Tenneco, a Texas-based conglomerate. Before their work was done that morning, events were set in motion that would culminate in a national debate over the uses and abuses of our national parks.

The National Park Service, which supervises Death Valley National Monument, denied a Tenneco request to drive a jeep to the claim sites. So the men had to walk, carrying the orange-tipped claim stakes on their backs. They picked their way down the steep, yellow shale slopes to the public hiking trail that winds through Gower Gulch. After about one mile in the mounting desert heat, the Tenneco men began posting the stakes at fifty-foot intervals, eventually laying claim to forty-four new borate mining sites in direct line-of-sight with Zabriskie Point.

The Park Service was horrified. The rangers had watched with growing alarm over the last five years as open-pit mining for borates and talc had destroyed hundreds of acres of the national monument. The Tenneco claims in Gower Gulch were the last straw.

It was the view from Zabriskie Point, more than one hundred years ago, that had moved pioneer William Manly to write that he had "just seen all of God's creation" from one place. Every year now, hundreds of thousands of visitors see what Manly saw, just the way he saw it. With a slight turn to the south, visitors can gaze in reverence while the slanting rays of early morning and late afternoon sun create an awesome display of color and shadow on the convoluted landscape of Gower Gulch. The decisive showdown between park partisans and strip miners would come here.

In the past, lands have been placed off-limits to mining in the monument in order to build campgrounds, develop water supply, or preserve historic or archeological sites. This time the Park Service asked for departmental authority to withdraw areas near Zabriskie Point and Gower Gulch from mineral entry in order to preserve their scenic and recreational value. The NPS director argued that roadbuilding and drilling associated with mining claims would jeopardize a Park Service proposal pending in Congress to designate a Death Valley wilderness area.

The reply from the head office sent shock waves through the environmental movement. Michele B. Metrinko, associate solicitor for the Interior Department, said the government's authority in Death Valley "does not include withdrawal of monument lands for the purpose of scenic preservation." Such a withdrawal, she added, would be in "direct contravention of an express congressional intent."

Indeed, Congress did specifically open Death Valley to mining on June 13, 1933, four months after the area became a national monument during the last days of the Hoover administration. In its rationale, Congress then said, "it would be unfortunate if the prospector who had been responsible for building up the romance and mystery of Death Valley were not allowed to prospect and operate in the future as he has in the past." Harold Ickes, who had just been named Secretary of the Interior in Franklin Roosevelt's first administration [quoting a statement by National Park Service director Horace M. Albright] assured Congress that "in recommending the establishment of this area as a national monument . . . it was not the desire to prevent prospecting and mining within the area, as such activities would in no way interfere with the preservation of the characteristics of the area."

It is true that prospecting for gold, silver, and later borax—"the white gold of the desert"—is permanently linked in fact and popular fancy with the lore of Death Valley. Actually, the twenty-mule teams hauled borax over the grueling 250-mile trek to Mojave, California, for only six years from 1883 to 1889. But it is an enduring Old West image, made more so in later years by the radio and television program "Death Valley Days," which was sponsored by U.S. Borax. C. B. Zabriskie was a president of that company. Harry P. Gower was its mine superintendent in Death Valley for fifty years.

More ironic still, the first director of the National Park Service, Stephen Mather, was a wealthy westerner whose family fortune was made by mining borax in Death Valley before he entered government service. A former advertising executive for Pacific Coast Borax Company, Stephen Mather coined the trademark "20 Mule Team Borax" that its successor company uses to this day. The second director of the NPS was Horace Albright, whose term covered the period when Death Valley became a national monument and was subsequently reopened to mining. Albright later left government service to take an ex-

ecutive position with U.S. Potash Co., later merged with Pacific Coast Borax to become U.S. Borax.

But for all the romance of the mines and the mule teams, one fact is perfectly clear: the grizzled pick-and-shovel prospector of old is a far cry from the massive earth-destroying strip mine operations going on today inside Death Valley National Monument. It is highly unlikely that anyone in Congress or the Administration in 1933 could have foreseen the present consequences of the legal loophole that they had hoped to leave open for the "colorful miner."

All of the ballyhooed search for lost El Dorados and easy wealth netted only about \$2 million between the 1880s and 1940. During World War II talc mines were opened in the monument to meet special military demands. The mines were underground and made little impact on the surface. Still, no more than \$1.5 million worth of minerals was taken out in any one year between 1940 and 1970. Then in 1971 strip mining began for both borates and talc. The Park Service estimates that \$12 million in those two minerals were stripped out of the monument in 1975, and Tenneco has told stockholders that it will increase its Death Valley operations by 50 percent over the next four years.

Borates are used principally in making glass, especially structural glass and insulation fiberglass. There are many lesser uses for borates in detergents, vitreous enamels, pharmaceuticals, and herbicides. Talc from Death Valley is used in paints and ceramics. Although talc is a common mineral, the only sizable reserves of borate found so far in the United States are in southern California and Nevada. But borate deposits at Boron and Searles Lake in California make Death Valley borate deposits small by comparison.

About 75 percent of the annual U.S. borate production is done at the U.S. Borax mine at Boron, about 110 miles southwest of the national monument. The reserves there are variously estimated at between forty and two hundred years at current production levels. Because of that comfortable supply, for more than fifty years U.S. Borax has not mined on its lands in Death Valley. The company holds extensive mining claims there, however, especially in the fifteen-mile borate-rich zone that includes the most popular scenic areas. Company officials are fighting hard to hang on to those claims as a potential source of borates "if and when we need them," according to one corporation spokesman.

Tenneco is the only company currently mining borate in Death Valley. Its Boraxo Pit, located about eight miles southeast of Zabriskie Point, gives some perspective to the scale of open-pit mining. The pit was begun in 1971. Today it is 3,000 feet long and 1,000 feet wide at the widest point. It has been dug to a depth of 240 feet and will go down another 180 feet before the depth makes mining unfeasible, later this year. Waste dumps from the Boraxo pit are 150 feet high and clearly visible from the heavily traveled road to Dante's View overlook. The "life span" of such a pit is about five years. Once exhausted, it is abandoned and a new pit is begun. Tenneco has already started on the Sigma Pit in the same general vicinity. The 180,000 tons of borate taken out of Death Valley each year amounts to less than 10 percent of total domestic production of that mineral.

In the early 1970s talc producers also found surface mining quicker and more economical in the short run than the old underground methods. Seven open-pit talc mines are now operated in the southern end of the monument by Johns-Manville Corp., Pfizer Inc., and Cypress Industrial Minerals Company. Talc mining is particularly destructive to the visual integrity of the valley because of the stark whiteness of the waste

dumps and stockpiles, which stand out vividly against the darker rock background.

Competition for Death Valley minerals is often cutthroat. Environmentalists weren't the only ones taken aback when Tenneco staked its forty-four controversial claims in Gower Gulch. U.S. Borax was also surprised, because that company had owned the land for several generations. Tenneco maintains that there is a flaw in U.S. Borax's title to the property and that the borates under the surface are still up for grabs. One Tenneco spokesman even suggested that his company had staked claims on top of U.S. Borax land in Gower Gulch in order to clarify ownership and protect the scenery from exploitation by an unidentified third party.

The fever pitch of strip mining and claim staking goes on in the national monument. About two hundred new mining claims—ranging from 20 to 160 acres each—are filed each year in Death Valley. Active interest is maintained in 1,827 claims covering more than 36,000 acres, according to the Park Service. The cumulative effect on the fragile desert ecosystem is probably equivalent to the scarring done by the giant corporate open pits, inasmuch as each claim must be worked every year to remain valid.

Death Valley is indeed fragile, though it is hard to think of fragility in an area so vast and seemingly impenetrable. It is the hottest, driest, lowest place in the Western Hemisphere. For thousands of years the forbidding landscape has stayed the hand of man. Massive faulting in prehistoric times thrust the Panamints and Amargosa mountain ranges skyward, letting the land between fall away to a hole in the earth. A ninety-mile-long lake dried up after the most recent Ice Age, leaving the marks of the descending water levels 20,000 years old still visible on Shoreline Buttes. The tortured landscape left behind inspired pioneers to create a whole lexicon of despair: Coffin Canyon, Funeral Mountains, Devil's Golf Course, Poison Spring, and Suicide Pass. It is still possible to stand alone in some parts of Death Valley and imagine what our world looked like before man appeared—a world inhospitable to life as we know it.

Once scarred, the desert is slow to heal itself. There is no salving annual blanket of falling leaves. Yearly rainfall is often less than one and a half inches, and potential evaporation is one hundred times that amount. Trails left by wild burros leave their imprint for decades. A crude, manmade road will last centuries. The activities of a human lifetime measure a split second in the geologic time of Death Valley, but the results of what we do will last forever.

On September 10, 1975, months after mining engineers had carried claim stakes into lower Gower Gulch, the public became aware of what was going on. The *Washington* (D.C.) *Star* reported that widespread strip mining was due to begin in some of the most scenic areas of the national monument because of recent rulings by the Department of the Interior. The story was picked up by other papers and by the national television networks. The mail from my California constituents began to pour in to my Washington office. Within three weeks, three bills were introduced in Congress to curtail mining in Death Valley, and the subject was raised in at least four committee sessions in the House and Senate—including in the Senate hearings on the confirmation of Thomas Kleppe to be Secretary of the Interior.

Another significant development was noted. On September 30, less than three weeks after the first article appeared, a member of my staff, flying low over Gower Gulch in a small aircraft, verified that the last Tenneco claim stake had been removed from the Zabriskie-Gower Gulch area. Public outcry had forced the corporate retreat—at least for the pres-

ent. But the area can be staked again—and legally—tomorrow, or whenever the public is no longer aroused. That message was made clear by the Interior solicitor's opinion. That is why I believe a change in the law is essential if this unique resource is going to be protected for the future.

I originally considered a special Death Valley bill, but instead joined other Senators on a bill (S. 2371) to forbid mining in Death Valley and five other units of the National Park System. The bill, which was introduced by Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, would take two important steps with regard to Death Valley. First it would repeal the 1933 law that opens the national monument to mining. That action would effectively end the issuance of any new claims and would strengthen the authority of the government to withdraw specific lands within the monument in order to protect their scenic values. Secondly—and I think this is most important—the Metcalf bill places an immediate three-year moratorium on existing claims. During that three years the government would study whether it should acquire the land outright in the public interest.

Interior committee hearings were held on S. 2371 on October 7, 1975. The testimony of several witnesses pointed out the basic contradiction posed by mining inside a national monument. Congress made its intent clear enough in 1916 when it passed the legislation creating the National Park System, declaring: "The fundamental purpose of the said parks and monuments . . . is to conserve the scenery and natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Congress must make it clear now and for the future that the federal government does have the right—and indeed the duty—to protect Death Valley and other units of the National Park System from mining or any other activity that diminishes the quality of the environment within them. Because of the special history and colorful lore of the lone prospector and his burro, Death Valley has remained open to mineral entry. But that open door has allowed bulldozers, hydraulic trucks, and other heavy equipment of the modern strip miner to pass through.

That door must now be closed in the public interest.

HONOR RABBI ISRAEL KOLLER

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I do like to take this occasion to formally note that tomorrow night, Congregation B'nai B'rith in Santa Barbara will honor Rabbi Israel Koller at a special Oneg Shabbat Service commemorating his 10th anniversary with the temple.

Rabbi Koller, though young in years, is widely respected in the community for his active concern about community life, senior citizen needs, and education. He has written and published articles in many journals, in English, Hebrew and Yiddish, and is listed in the 1972 edition "Who Is Who in World Jewry."

To his many friends in the community and within the congregation, he has pro-

vided inspiration and guidance by both word and deed, and he and his wife, Margaret, have enriched and enlivened our community. I know the members will join me in extending their best wishes on this occasion to him and his congregation and Mazel Tov.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL FUTURE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have introduced legislation which would establish a nonresident income tax in the District of Columbia. I realize full well that this is not a very popular subject and I do not expect this action to make me a hero in any quarter, certainly not in Virginia and Maryland—for obvious reasons—and not in official Washington for it falls far short of that which has been proposed at City Hall. My decision to move ahead on this issue is based on what I believe to be a realistic assessment of future fiscal sanity.

There is no governmental entity—be it State, local, or Federal—which has not experienced an increase in expenditures in recent years. Further, there is no economist willing to speculate that that spiral will decrease in the foreseeable future. During this time, most cities and States across the Nation have been forced to seek new sources of revenue—through the obvious route of additional taxation—and those which did not face the issue honestly, like New York City—have reached the brink of financial disaster and bankruptcy. I would add that because of the current impasse on revenue sharing, there is an element of panic creeping through many of our city halls and State capitols today.

Through all this, one community has suffered more than the others because of its uniqueness and that of course is the District of Columbia. Obviously, the District has not escaped the increases in expenditures but it has been constrained from seeking additional revenue because it does not control its own destiny due to congressional restrictions on its ability to tax. What can the city do if it is to avoid financial ruin? What can it do especially if our Founding Fathers' principle of self-government is to retain any vitality and meaning in the Nation's Capital?

It should be remembered that the District has no State or county base to call on for additional revenues or aid in providing services. Despite that lack of assistance, the District must perform the functions not only of a city but of a State and county as well. While it carries that burden, an estimated \$98.5 million worth of its real property tax base goes untaxed because of the Federal presence. Furthermore, nonresidents, who take 55 percent of the total personal income earned in the District, go untaxed.



Yes, there are alternatives. The first is an increase in the Federal payment. This, of course, would mean that the citizens of Chicago, Bridgeport, Los Angeles, Dallas, and so on would have to share an increased burden for the city's survival. Another alternative is the utilization of a well-known nuisance tax, one which is effectively employed by the city of New York—the toll bridge.

There are other possibilities but I believe that the most equitable alternative to be the one I have proposed today. Before I discuss the specifics of the bill, I think it is significant to note at this point that more than 40,000 residents of my congressional district in Connecticut pay a nonresident income tax to the city of New York. In fact, a tax of this nature is not unique for there are 51 municipalities employing this concept in the Nation today. I would say that in most instances, and I can speak particularly for my constituents, people do not pay this tax joyfully but they do so dutifully since they realize it must be paid for the economic well-being of the city in which they work depends upon it. They also know that the death of an urban center ultimately results in the slow strangulation of its suburbs.

Let me now turn to some of the bill's highlights:

First. Taxable income for the purposes of this tax defined as an individual's net income share of an unincorporated business, wages, and salaries whose source is in the District;

Second. Exemption of the first \$6,500 in gross income;

Third. Tax rate of 1½ percent on taxable income. Exemption creates a graduation of the effective rate on gross income. Wage earner making \$14,000 pays an effective rate of eight-tenths of 1 percent;

Fourth. This tax would be creditable against the nonresident's State income tax;

Fifth. Congress imposes tax and only Congress can change the rate;

Sixth. For the most part, tax collected through payroll withholding, eliminating the need for complicated forms;

Seventh. Removal of the tax exemption for Members of Congress and congressional employees;

Eighth. The elimination of the District's unincorporated business franchise tax.

Preliminary estimates are that the net revenue yield for this proposal to the District of Columbia will be in the area of \$37.5 million, an amount which accounts for only 3.3 percent of the District's proposed 1977 budget.

The average wage earner making \$14,000 annually would pay \$112.50 annually which could be credited against his or her Maryland or Virginia State income tax.

Expanding briefly on two of the points. I would remove the unincorporated business tax since it is one which already applies to nonresidents and for the most part, I find it to be inefficient and inequitable. Second—so as to bring my "antihero" status full circle—my bill would require Members of Congress and their employees to pay this tax. In all

candor, I cannot go on and on about fairness and allow the congressional exemption to remain.

I would also like to speak briefly to the concept of a "fair share."

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has found that large cities with populations of 250,000 or more tend to have larger per capita costs and that "Part of these additional costs seem likely to result from the greater use that commuters \* \* \* make of the larger central cities." Too often, the reasons given for taxing nonresidents rest solely upon a count of the direct benefits which a nonresident receives from the city in the course of a working day—police and fire protection and maintenance of a workplace. Forgotten in the debate are the more indirect costs which commuting imposes on the residents of the city. How does one quantify the exact cost of pollution. Or the cost in inconvenience of congested city streets. The costs are there, however, and are now entirely borne by District residents. This bill does not even come close to that proportion.

I would anticipate two major criticisms of this proposal, the first being the contention that through a number of other taxes—sales, parking, et cetera—the commuter already makes a significant contribution to the city. Certainly, this cannot be denied but the uncertainty of this type of revenue does little to give the city a firm hold on the future. There is no guarantee that everyone is going to use his or her car on a given day nor is it certain that a purchase will be made. Furthermore, it is felt that the commuting Federal employee generally stays within the Federal enclave—and not in the business community—during his or her normal workday. Also, there will be those who will say: "Taxation without representation." Therein lies the key to congressional consideration of this proposal for the people of Virginia and Maryland are well and energetically represented by voting Members in Congress and voting members on the District Committee. It is important to note that the congressional representative of the people of the District of Columbia brings the same vitality to his job but he is denied that all-important right to vote. If the District of Columbia City Council were to enact this measure, Virginia and Maryland Congressmen would have no say at all and then—and only then—would that criticism be true.

Last, let me say that if enacted this measure will not be the total answer to the District's financial woes. The city must take steps on its own and pursue a vigorous approach to responsible spending policies and a greater effort toward collecting that which is owed.

Preliminary reports from the District Building indicate that many members of the City Council agree and their performance in getting a handle on unnecessary growth in the District's budget will determine their success in pressing the case for a nonresident income tax. I believe in home rule, and I believe the City Council will make responsible attempts to achieve the goal of fiscal responsibility.

I would add that those who believe that more Federal money is the only answer to the District's fiscal problems will have a difficult time convincing the Nation's taxpayers and their Representatives in Congress of that if the city's commuters are not contributing some share for the city's expenses.

I am convinced that this is legislation which is necessary for the fiscal and economic well-being and viability of not only the District of Columbia, but the entire Washington metropolitan area.

#### BRITISH EDITOR DEPLORES PUBLICIZING OF U.S. NATIONAL SECRETS

#### HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a very perceptive and well-thought-out guest opinion was included in the CBS News on Monday morning, January 26.

The opinion relates directly to the actions of our House Select Committee on Intelligence and other congressional units investigating the CIA and other intelligence agencies. The opinion expressed by Peregrine Worsthorne, deputy editor of the London Sunday Telegraph, warrants our most careful study and reflection.

It is one thing to investigate the secrets and secret activities of the intelligence community. It is quite something else to publicize these secrets and to expose individuals to the public reaction which can come from such revelations.

While the opinion expressed is that of Mr. Worsthorne, it deserves a serious examination and a most thoughtful review by the Members of this body and by the American people.

The CBS guest opinion follows:

STATEMENT BY PEREGRINE WORTHORNE

A great many non-Americans throughout the world have done jobs for the CIA in the last quarter of a century for reasons ranging from love of money to love of freedom. So far as the Third World countries are concerned there can be few anti-Communist politicians or people of influence whose names don't appear on the CIA files. Yet these same people, these pro-Americans who never went along with the anti-American fashion of the post-war years, are now being put at risk by the Congressional and media hounding of the CIA, since we never know when our names may appear in some sensational revelation, with consequences varying from mild embarrassment to mortal peril. For a great power to indulge in cleansing its own domestic conscience by doing dirt on its foreign friends is, to my mind, deeply shocking. Imagine if the Soviet Union, in a fit of madness, were to compel the KGB to open its files and expose all the innumerable Communist fellow travelers throughout the world who've had dealings with it since the war! Such revelations would do the Soviet Union irreparable harm, since never again would its friends feel willing to hitch their wagon to so treacherous a star. No doubt the CIA does need investigating, but it's almost beginning to seem as if the American Congress and media are more concerned to punish those who spied for America than

those who spied against her, determined to heap just as much moral condemnation on CIA officials as they were at the height of the McCarthy witch hunt on traitors like Alger Hiss, even to the point of putting their lives at risk.

As a life-long lover of the United States, who has publicly defended her actions for many years, I find this witch hunt against the CIA just as bad, if not worse, than any of the dirty tricks it's meant to expose. At least the CIA dirty tricks were aimed at destroying America's enemies. But this dirty trick endangers her friends. A great country can commit no worse crime than that.

## GUNS DO KILL PEOPLE

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, is it really true that if we place a ban on handguns, only criminals will have them? This question is constantly raised by some people who write expressing concern about handgun control and what it would do to those who depend upon a gun for protection. Is it equally true that, as the saying goes, guns do not kill people, people kill people?

The following remarks by Boston Police Commissioner Robert Di Grazia, which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, respond to the many arguments used by opponents of gun control.

The article follows:

EXCERPTS FROM FORUM SPEECH BY BOSTON POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT DI GRAZIA

It is my view that law must banish private handguns from this country. I am not asking for registration or licensing or outlawing cheap "Saturday Night Specials." I am saying that no private citizen, whatever his claim, should possess a handgun; only police officers and the military should. I want to see this accomplished by outlawing the manufacture, distribution, sale, ownership, and possession of handguns. During the first six months after the law is passed, all handgun owners should be permitted to turn in their guns receiving fair market value for them. After the end of that amnesty period, anyone caught with a handgun in his possession should be severely punished. Any crime committed with one should be punished far more severely than that same crime committed without a handgun. Many people think this is a radical position. My position is not radical. It is the current situation which is radical and unreasonable. They ask "Wouldn't you accept something less?" My answer to that is "No." Let me explain why.

As long as we have handguns available, they will continue to be misused. People will continue to accidentally shoot one another as well as themselves. Lives and limbs will be lost needlessly. They will continue to be the main source of violent crime. It is often said that guns don't commit crimes, people do. The supposition here is that if handguns were not available, the criminal would find something else. Undoubtedly, this would be true in some cases, although it may not lead to as many deaths. However, in many other cases, the unavailability of a handgun could mean the non-commission of a violent crime. The wife and husband arguing would not be able to grab a handgun and easily end a life. The juvenile robber might not have the perverted boldness to commit his crime with-

out the handgun. The concealability of a handgun, its depersonalized lethal nature, all give him the slight psychological edge needed to commit his crime. Given another weapon, he might not think he has the force to commit his crime. With a handgun he knows he has the ultimate force, the power to kill easily. In short, people do commit crimes but handguns make it easier and in some cases, inspire the commission of violent crime.

"If we abolish handguns and have people turn them in, won't only the criminals have handguns? In the beginning, the answer to this is probably yes. But that is what the police are for. We have been entrusted with the responsibility for personal protection. Individuals need not, and in fact will not, be safer by carrying their own handguns. America has not yet returned to those yesteryears where the one gun-toting citizen must protect himself against another gun-toting citizen. In our more civilized society we have turned the use of lethal force over to the police. The police will continue to protect citizens against harm while handguns are removed from circulation. It will take time, but eventually the handgun will be as rare as the buffalo roaming the prairies. Perhaps then we will be as safe from the carnage of handguns as other civilized nations which long ago eliminated this deadly anachronism.

"National legislation is needed because scattered tough state laws can't do the job. Handguns don't observe state boundaries. As long as there is a pool of handguns available, there will always be the same problems. As this Nation celebrates its 200th birthday, it is perhaps appropriate to look at the goals set out for us by our founding fathers. The Preamble of the Constitution declares the need to "insure domestic tranquility." Two hundred years later I would hope that we now see that national legislation abolishing handguns is a substantial step toward that goal."

## REVOLUTIONARY TERRORISTS HOLD EXPANSION CONFERENCE

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a national meeting organized by supporters of the terrorist Weather Underground Organization will be held this weekend, January 30-February 1, 1976, in Chicago. This meeting, the National Hard Times Conference, is the result of 7 months of work by the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee—PFOC—the aboveground support arm of the Weather Underground terrorists.

Prairie Fire organizers report that some 1,300 activists are expected to attend the meetings to be held on the Circle Campus of Roosevelt University. Eleven buses have been scheduled to leave Union Square in New York City tonight—January 29. In addition car pools and buses are being organized from Ithaca, Buffalo, San Diego, San Francisco, Milwaukee, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Boston, Seattle, Columbus, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Oregon.

While the ostensible purpose of the conference is to organize pressure for socialist solutions to the economic slump, the true purpose of the National Hard Times Conference is to develop and ex-

pand the circle of sympathizers around the Weather Underground Organization.

As I pointed out in my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports on the PFOC on October 3, 1975, and October 28, 1975, the plans for the conference emerged from a secret meeting of the PFOC held July 11-13, 1975, in Boston and Cambridge, Mass.

In line with the Weather Underground Organization's new position calling for mass organizing, the Prairie Fire cadres called for a meeting ostensibly to discuss economic issues, to build "solidarity" with third world revolutionary movements and set the stage for a WUO-directed national political organization.

New York organizing is being coordinated by former Weather Underground fugitive Russ Neufeld, who has been working for the National Lawyers Guild's pro-armed struggle prison newsletter, the Midnight Special, and Marcy Isaacs from offices in Room 411, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 (212/691-9281); and by Ellen Afterman from a hole-in-the-wall office at 53 West Jackson, Room 1601, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

While having received only some fifty preregistrations—\$3—Afterman has been directing those seeking housing during the 3-day conference to a "flophouse" called Liberty Hall at 2440 North Lincoln. Liberty Hall is owned by John "Johnny Appleseed" Rossen, an aging former Communist Party, U.S.A. organizer who previously served as landlord to the old SDS national office and as the revolutionary "grandfather" figure on the SDS National Interim Committee in 1968-69 when it was controlled by the Weatherman faction.

Rossen is also the founder of the People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC—a Marxist "educational" group currently receiving national media attention for their warped distortion of the principles of America's Founding Fathers. While former Chicagoan Jeremy Rifkin runs the PBC's national operation, Rossen is still its leading figure in Chicago.

Rossen has made Liberty Hall available to Hard Times conferees for a dollar-a-head per night, sleeping bags anywhere you can find space. Although Rossen's People's Bicentennial Commission denounces the free enterprise system, he expects to turn a tidy profit from his sleazy slum holdings this weekend.

The Hard Times conference will commence on Friday evening, January 30, with a "People's Tribunal" to denounce the "economic crimes" of the free enterprise system. The Saturday morning keynote speaker will be the PFOC national secretary, Jennifer Dohrn, sister of the fugitive WUO leader, Bernardine Dohrn.

The WUO support coalition will discuss plans for mass disruptions of the July 4 Bicentennial celebrations in Philadelphia. The Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary group backed by the Cubans, has already called for a mass mobilization to demand American abandonment of Puerto Rico—to PSP control—in the name of decolonization.

It is also noted in passing that the alienated anarchist drug abusers of the Youth International Party—YIP—report in their tabloid, the Yipster Times, that



they too will attempt to bring numbers of street freaks and radical heads to Philadelphia for July 4. Since 1968, the YIP has served to bring numbers of alienated young people to the national political conventions where they have served as the shock troops for the more disciplined revolutionaries in street battles with police.

The PFOC is using the militant cadres of Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF—the youth arm of the Workers World Party, a Trotskyist Communist group, to assist in the organizing.

YAWF has a record of more than a decade of violent street confrontations with police. YAWF members, male and female, have never shrunk from staging club-wielding battles with police, and before the Weatherman SDS faction went underground, YAWF often participated in running street rampages alongside the Weathermen.

YAWF and its parent party have provided political support for virtually every revolutionary guerrilla and terrorist movement in the third world. YAWF supports the Chilean MIR, the Argentinian ERP, the MPLA in Angola, the Soviet-backed guerrillas in Oman, the Vietnamese and the Eritrean revolutionaries in Ethiopia; but for nearly a decade, YAWF's most passionate devotion has been to the fanatical butchers of the Palestine Liberation Organization—PLO—whose slaughter of school children, athletes and tourists YAWF hailed with enthusiasm.

The cosponsoring groups for the National Hard Times Conference include a number of equally violent organizations and individuals. Sponsors include the Cuban-dominated Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—the American Indian Movement—AIM—Attica Now; Friends of Indochina; CASA—General Brotherhood of Workers—United Black Workers; Harlem Fight Back; the San Quentin Six Defense Committee, a Communist Party, U.S.A.-dominated support group for prison inmates accused of murder during an attempted jailbreak; and the City Star underground newspaper.

The terrorist support groups and their allies are planning to mass thousands of radical demonstrators in Philadelphia on July 4 to disrupt the Bicentennial commemoration. Bicentennial officials have predicted that as many as half-a-million patriotic Americans may attend the July 4th festivities.

The potential for "affinity" wolf packs of revolutionaries rioting through the crowds of tourists is unmistakable. The tactics have been used before at the 1968 Democratic National Convention, at the 1969 Presidential Inauguration, during many large "antiwar" rallies, and in Miami at the 1972 Republican National Convention.

In addition there is a clear danger of terrorist bombings taking place during the Bicentennial celebrations. The Puerto Rican Socialist Party's rallies and meetings have been accompanied by support bombings by the FALN. The Weather Underground has also committed bombings in support of PSP causes. And both the WUO and its PFOC have said,

The rulers have set the time for the party; Let us bring the fireworks.

The Hard Times conference is to consider plans for mass demonstrations during 1976. Dates targeted include March 8, International Women's Day; 2 weeks of demonstrations in Washington, D.C., tentatively set for April 15 through May 1 centering on the demand "Jobs for All"; July 4; and national or local demonstrations on November 1, 1976, the anniversary of the 1950 revolt in Puerto Rico and the assassination attempt on President Truman.

Revolutionary terrorists have often tended to mark special days of revolutionary significance with bombings. Prime target dates have included March 8—International Women's Day; May 1—May Day; July 4; July 26—Castro's attack on the Moncada; August 7—atomic bombs; September 11—downfall of the Allende regime in Chile; and November 1—Puerto Rican revolt.

At a time when the overt arm of the revolutionary terrorists is holding a national meeting, the Chicago Police Department has its hands tied and the revolutionaries know it. Members of the Chicago police force have recently testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that they have been forbidden to gather information on Communist revolutionary groups and their fronts.

Yet the Weather Underground Organization states in its publications that it is a Communist organization. Youth Against War and Fascism is a Trotskyist Communist organization. The Puerto Rican Socialist Party also states that it is a Marxist-Leninist, that is, Communist, movement. And many of the cosponsoring groups also fall within this category.

The disgrace is that politically oriented members of the Chicago Police Department, fearing radical court suits and liberal political pressure, have forbidden its officers to protect Chicago's citizens from the revolutionaries because the revolutionaries are "political." What has happened to the rights of American citizens in Chicago and other cities and States to be protected from terrorist assaults on their rights to "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness"?

Let us hope that the citizens of Chicago will make their police force responsive to their need for protection before the Weather Underground, the FALN and their allies abolish our constitutional rights once and for all.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF CONGRESSMAN CONYERS

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the House considered the conference report to the Public Works Employment Act of 1975. Inasmuch as this legislation will provide funding to local and State gov-

ernments for local public works and provide needed jobs for unemployed Americans, I regret that I was unable to join my 321 colleagues who voted "aye" on the report.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO MRS. CORNELIA HARRINGTON SANDERS, YOUNGEST MEMBER OF 1960 U.S. WINTER OLYMPIC ICE SKATING TEAM NAMED TO THE OLD TIMERS ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION 1975 "SPORTS HALL OF FAME"

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate our Nation's Bicentennial Year, it is most fitting that we reflect upon the outstanding accomplishments of our people and, today, I would like to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress the standards of excellence and success of the achievements of a former resident of my hometown of Wayne, Mrs. Cornelia Harrington Sanders, who has been named to the roll of honor in the "Sports Hall of Fame" of the Old Timers Athletic Association of Greater Paterson, N.J., located in my congressional district.

Cornelia, widely known as "Pooch," when she came to Packanack Lake, Wayne, N.J., as a young miss from the place of her birth, Tarrytown, N.Y., achieved many plateaus of honor in our community including garden display awards, oratorical prizes, swimming races, and many, many friends. As a 4-H member, she attained the first "blue ribbon" championship award in Wayne Township for her garden display. As a student at Holy Cross Elementary School she won first prize in an oratorical contest for several years, and before she entered ice skating competition, she won several awards in swimming competition.

Ice skating championships for speed racing to her credit in "junior girls" competition in 1959, just prior to earning the right to represent the United States in the Olympics were:

The Tri-State Outdoor Championship;

The Eastern States Outdoor Championship in Saratoga, N.Y., breaking an 880-yard record of 26 years standing;

Middle Atlantic Outdoor Championship in Newburgh, N.Y.; and

Eastern Seaboard Speed Skating Championship at Saranac Lake, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted at this point in our historical journal of Congress a recent news story that appeared in the Herald News, one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, authored by their distinguished staffwriter, Joan Wiessmann, which most eloquently describes Cornelia Harrington Sanders' athletic endeavors that have earned her the highly esteemed election to the Sports Hall of Fame of the Old Timers A. A. of Greater Paterson. The news article is as follows:

**"POOCH" NOW A HALL OF FAME**  
(By Joan Weissmann)

WAYNE.—There'll be a proud gleam in the eyes of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Harrington when their daughter is inducted into the "Old Timers AA of Greater Paterson Sports Hall of Fame" on Nov. 30 at the Bethwood Inn, Totowa.

Cornelia Harrington Sanders, better known as "Pooch," at 16 was the youngest member ever to be placed on a Winter Olympic Squad speed skating team. That was in 1960. Actually, she was 15 when she won the 3,000 meter race at the Olympic trials at Minneapolis which catapulted her, coincidentally, onto the first Olympic women's skating team.

The vigorous brunette will be interviewed at 10 p.m. Sunday during a 30-minute program on Channel WTEN, an affiliate of CBS, out of Albany, N.Y. She'll be asked to review her life since the time she broke a 26-year standing record in the Eastern States Outdoor Race, and won the Middle Atlantic Outdoor and the Eastern Seaboard Speed Skating races prior to placing for the Olympics, to the present time.

These events must surge up memories for Tom Harrington, who timed daughter "Pooch" on early winter mornings when her blades flashed around the lake at the Packanack community where she was raised, and for the two years she practiced daily—at an ice skating rink then located where the massive Willowbrook Shopping Center is now situated—prior to the Olympic trials.

The 5 foot 2, 116 pound speed skater got an uproarious reception from her De Paul High School colleagues when she returned to classes after copping a berth on the Olympic team. At the time, she was also only the second 15-year-old to be included on this country's winter Olympic teams. The first was skiing sensation Andrea Mead Lawrence.

An ardent swimmer before she got the skating bug, Pooch (so named because she was "friendly as a puppy") later went on to get her BA and masters degree in psychology at Boston University and is a practicing psychologist at the Capitol District Psychiatric Center in Albany, N.Y.

The TV interviewer on Sunday's program will soon learn that Pooch moved rapidly around the college campus, too, earning another "first" when she became the first woman president of the Boston University honor society, The Scarlet Key. A member of Psi Chi, a national academic honor society in psychology, she was named "Outstanding Student of the Year 1975" at Boston University and was included in "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities, 1965."

Married to Gerry Sanders Jr., Pooch and her husband return to her former 104 Beechwood Dr. home to visit her parents whenever busy schedules permit. Recent mild winters have been bummers for ice skating enthusiasts at Packanack Lake where Pooch's interest in skating was first aroused. But nostalgia must assail her at the sight of the lake where she developed an Olympian stride and later became the toast of her town.

She represented the Willowbrook Skating Club when she surprised her competitors and sports analytics by qualifying for the Olympic team. For this, the Old Timers Athletic Association has chosen to induct her in the Greater Paterson Sports Hall of Fame at a 1:30 p.m. banquet at the Bethwood.

The Hall of Fame is at Lambert Castle in Paterson.

Mr. Speaker, may I also commend to you the members of the Old Timers A.A. Association of Greater Paterson whose leadership endeavors and achievements above and beyond their career pursuits, civic and social endeavors which number them amongst the leading citizens of our

community have intertwined with the spirit of community interest and friendly cooperation of athletes and sports organizations to establish a "Sports Hall of Fame" to help preserve the historic significance and public acclaim of the extraordinary athletic achievements of the youth of America. I know you will want to join with me in extending our deepest appreciation to the following officers and members of the 1976 Sports Hall of Fame Committee:

**SPORTS HALL OF FAME COMMITTEE**

The Honorable: Dom Trowse, Chairman; Ben Marino, Co-Chairman; Edward A. Haines, Honorary Chairman; Edward Madama, Sam Sibillo, Dinner Chairmen; Herman C. Madama, Souvenir Journal; Dom Dinardo, Treasurer and Secretary; Bob Potts, Historian; Abe Greene, Welcome; Sam Sibillo, Induction Officer; Bennie Borgmann, President Old Times.

Benny Borgmann, Robert J. Passero, Jack McFadyen, Anthony DeSopo, Mike Denice, Ted Ferguson, James LaBagnara, John Mayers.

Bert Bertani, Elmor Shaver, Don Caputo, Pat Felano, Charles Trombetta, Champ Snell, Tom Elm, Sr.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The Honorable: Bob Whitting, Retired Sports Editor, Record; Chuck Pezzano, Bowling Editor, Record; Jammy Salvato, News Outdoor Editor; Mike Batelli, Outdoor Editor, Record; Bob Curley, Sports Editor, Paterson News; Harry Lev, News Boxing Editor; Augie Lio, Sports Editor, Herald News; Ron Rippey, Assistant Sports Editor, Paterson News.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to seek this national recognition of the youngest member of the 1960 U.S. Olympic Ice Skating Team and the youthful achievements of the former Cornelia "Pooch" Harrington. It is also interesting to note that in her maturity as Mrs. Cornelia Sanders she continues to serve as a shining example for, and champion of, the youth of America.

In June 1973, Cornelia married Mr. Gerald A. Sanders, Jr., at the Immaculate Heart of Mary Church in my hometown of Wayne at a nuptial mass celebrated by Very Rev. Msgr. John P. McHugh and her cousin, Father William Bestos, C.S.C., Superior of the Holy Cross Fathers, Stonehill College, Mass. Mr. Sanders, who attained his degree in sociology from the college of St. Rose, is a national director of the Young Men's Christian Association and former director of the Youth Organization of Green Island, N.Y. Cornelia is a psychologist at the Capital District Psychiatric Center, Albany City Unit, a multidisciplinary treatment team in a community-based State hospital providing outpatient psychiatric care, where she has served with distinction since 1969.

Cornelia has always manifested the highest standards of excellence in everything she has set out to do and I am pleased to share the pride of her family and many, many friends in the success of her achievements since accepting her present position dedicated to individual and family therapy with emphasis on evaluation, crisis intervention, consultation and supervision services. We point with pride also to the Tuesday Night

Twilight Social Club established in Albany in 1970 which she helped to develop and where she currently serves as staff consultant. This organization helps provide a low-key, non-threatening social experience and warm, easy-going atmosphere to provide social supports for troubled people in the community and help avert their rehospitalization.

In 1970 Cornelia was the architect of the program plan and design for the development of the widely acclaimed multiagency, multiservice center, the St. Johns Human Resources Center Project, which has been implemented by the Model Cities Program in Cohoes, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, Cornelia Harrington Sanders' story relates a wonderful championship performance of a great young lady and I am pleased to present it to you during our Bicentennial Year in reflecting on the achievements of the people of our Nation. We do indeed salute Cornelia for her contribution to the "American Dream."

**INNOVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT  
AT RAMAPO COLLEGE**

**HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate Ramapo College of New Jersey on its initial accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The board of trustees, President Potter and the staff of the college deserve full recognition for this accomplishment which comes 4 short years after Ramapo opened its doors to students.

There are many aspects to this achievement that should be recognized:

It is quantitative. Several thousand New Jersey students have been enrolled.

It is qualitative. As the Middle States evaluation team indicated in the introduction to their report, "The very best aspects of the liberal arts experience are to be found here" at Ramapo College. This assessment of quality has been confirmed by the considered judgment of the nationally distinguished consultants who have reviewed the colleges programs for the New Jersey Board of Higher Education.

It is innovative. The college community has boldly designed a relevant and personalized interdisciplinary curriculum which deserves wider attention.

I am particularly impressed by the college's efforts to make higher education accessible to all types of students:

There is a Saturday College for working adults.

There is a transition program for veterans and mature women.

There are barrier-free facilities for physically handicapped.

There is a flexibility of program which eases access for senior citizens.

There is an educational opportunity program for disadvantaged populations.



All of these have been provided without compromising a strong academic program for traditional students in science, humanities, social science, business, and the arts.

For the citizens of its home county, Bergen, the college also offers a wealth of natural resources—its fine lecture halls, its new gymnasium, a modern science building, and its most valuable natural resource of all—its outstanding people.

Ramapo College of New Jersey is one of the successes of the social initiatives of the late 1960's in New Jersey. In this instance governmental planning worked; educational innovation was encouraged; and adequate budgetary support was provided. The newly created New Jersey Board of Higher Education and the Department of Higher Education were vital spurs, and the citizens of New Jersey by their votes for bond issues were supportive.

In my judgment we must continue to support such successes.

**JUSTICE CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY ON THE FEDERAL BENCH**

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this week, Constance Baker Motley was appointed a Federal judge in the southern district of the State of New York. The significance of this appointment lies in the fact that she was the first black woman to be so named. Her appointment culminated a life of achievement and dedication to the cause of civil rights and justice for all Americans.

In my continuing effort to share with my colleagues the contributions that black people have made to our Nation, I insert the following biographical sketch of Judge Motley which appeared in the New York Times of January 26, 1966. After my colleagues have read this account of her life, I am sure they will agree with me that Constance Baker Motley is indeed a shining example of the true spirit of '76.

The full text of the article follows:

**CHOICE FOR U.S. BENCH—CONSTANCE BAKER MOTLEY**

There was a great and general sigh of relief in many city agencies yesterday. Constance Baker Motley, a singleminded woman, had been selected as a Federal judge, and the boat that she had been rocking in government since she became Manhattan Borough President would hopefully sail into calmer water. Mrs. Motley is tall and handsome (although the camera tends to make her appear larger than she is) and her smile is as warm as that of an old lady who has just been helped across the street.

But she has been, in turn, one of the toughest civil rights lawyers in the country, the first Negro woman to sit in the State Senate and, as Borough President, a head rattling questioner of, for example, city planners' favorite plans.

"I'm going to light a candle on the way home," a city official who had once opposed one of her redevelopment plans said after learning that she was moving on to the court.

Another said, in awe, that "she really senses the public feeling and moves in on it to get what she wants—a real dynamo, yes, a real dynamo."

To this sort of spoken or implied criticism, Mrs. Motley says, as she did recently: "City government is becoming highly centralized. Citizens and organizations are shunted sometimes from pillar to post as they seek to express to public officials legitimate needs and complaints."

**HELPED THROUGH COLLEGE**

Manhattan's first woman Borough President then promptly eliminated nine engineering positions from her office, replaced them with eight general assistants and summed up the reorganization as "reflecting the changing role of my office as the chief spokesman of the local communities in city government."

Constance Baker was born in New Haven on Sept. 14, 1921. Her parents had migrated from the British West Indies. Her father was a chef, and did not have the money to send her or her five sisters and two brothers to college.

When she was 18, and a year and a half out of high school with no prospect of going to college, she got up to talk about civil rights in a community house meeting. "You know how 18-year-olds can sound off," she said many years later.

A man in the audience, the late Clarence Blakeslee, a white businessman who had donated much to Negro welfare and education, was impressed, however. When the gangling, intense young Negro girl told him she wanted to go to college and become a lawyer, Mr. Blakeslee gave her the chance, financing her education.

After studying for more than a year at Fisk University, she graduated from New York University with a degree in economics. She then studied law at Columbia University graduating in 1946.

Her first job was as clerk to Thurgood Marshall in the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund. Another lawyer in the office was Edward Dudley, now a State Supreme Court justice, who was Mrs. Motley's predecessor as Manhattan Borough President.

While working for the Defense Fund she moved with the civil rights storm as a lawyer noted as a persistent questioner, who was usually logical, always direct and simple in her summations and often quite witty.

In Albany, Ga., in the summer of 1962, several witnesses testified that Negro leaders had whipped their followers into a frenzy during mass meetings in Negro churches.

Mrs. Motley's response, in her final summation, was roughly as follows.

**COUNSEL TO MEREDITH**

"Now about those frenzied meetings, your honor. Weren't they held in Baptist churches? Everybody knows that Southern Baptists sometimes get pretty emotional in church. We wouldn't want to take that away from them, would we?" The judge grinned, numerous spectators smiled, and Mrs. Motley went on to a more direct argument.

In the same year Mrs. Motley represented James H. Meredith, a Negro who was seeking admission to the University of Mississippi.

In February, 1963, in a special election, she was elected as a Democrat-Liberal to the State Senate, where she served for two years as the only woman in that legislative body. She became borough President in 1965 when Mr. Dudley, also a Negro, was appointed to the court. She was elected to the post in November, running as a Democrat, Liberal and Republican.

In 1946 Mrs. Motley was married to Joel

Motley, an insurance and real estate broker. They have one son, Joel Jr., 14. The family lives at 875 West End Avenue.

**THE RIGHT MAN AT THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME**

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1975, on the occasion of the 112th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, a distinguished group gathered in Soldier's National Cemetery in Gettysburg for the purpose of commemorating that event once again and, most importantly, for the purpose of dedicating the Kentucky State monument. I certainly wanted to be there to welcome the Honorable Julian N. Carroll, the Governor of Kentucky, but business here in the House prevented that. My father, former Congressman George Goodling, was present, however, and later advised me of the great success of the ceremony. My colleague, BILL NATCHER, of Kentucky, has obtained a copy of the Governor's remarks which he will later be inserting in the RECORD. At this time I would like to share with you the remarks of my own constituent, the Honorable John A. MacPhail, present judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Adams County, Pa. In addition to being a fine judge, Judge MacPhail is learned in the history of our area. I think all Americans will be interested in his comments on President Lincoln and the creation of the Gettysburg Address. Judge MacPhail's remarks follow:

**THE RIGHT MAN AT THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME**

Governor Carroll, distinguished citizens from the state of Kentucky, honored guests, members of the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania, ladies and gentlemen. At the outset I must confess that attempting to speak on this occasion is somewhat analogous to attempting to say something different about Christmas or the Fourth of July. But perhaps, like the message of Christmas and the Fourth of July, what happened here 112 years ago bears repeating again and again.

Throughout its 200 year history the United States of America in every crisis has somehow produced the right man at the right place at the right time. I would hope it would not be considered irreligious to observe that a George Washington at Valley Forge, a Thomas Jefferson in Philadelphia, a General Pershing in France and a Dwight David Eisenhower in Europe suggest something of Divine intervention in the affairs of this nation. No more perfect example of that observation could be found than Abraham Lincoln as President of this country at a time when it came closest to disintegration.

Until July 4, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln endured political and military reversals at almost every turn. It seemed like an almost endless wait for good news—any good news. On July 4, a date that time and again seems to be marked in our history by some kind of Divine designation since July 4, 1776, something approaching a change in military fortunes occurred in 1863. On that day General U. S. Grant won a victory at Vicksburg. On that day, General Robert E. Lee began his retreat from Gettysburg.

Shortly after July 4, 1863, Governor Andrew Curtin of Pennsylvania came to Gettysburg from Harrisburg to survey the human carnage strewn the fields of battle here. After a brief review of the situation the Governor designated a concerned Gettysburg citizen and lawyer, David Wills, as his representative to make arrangements for the care of the wounded. A few days later, Mr. Wills informed the Governor that a task of more urgency than the care of the wounded here was the burial of the dead. Together with the problem, Mr. Wills proposed to the Governor a solution—the purchase of 17 acres of land to be used as a cemetery and to be financed by the 18 states whose loyal sons died here. He also suggested that the cemetery be symmetrically designed and that the ground be consecrated by appropriate ceremonies. The Governor of Pennsylvania and the governors of the other 17 states accepted the proposal. Thus was conceived the first cemetery in the United States devoted exclusively to the burial of soldiers.

With the help of others, Mr. Wills arranged for the exhumation of the bodies for reburial, engaged a landscape gardener from Germantown to design the cemetery plot and designated October 23 as the date to consecrate that ground by appropriate ceremonies. Edward Everett, former President of Harvard University and the nation's foremost orator was invited to be the main speaker. He informed Mr. Wills that he would be honored to perform this task but could not possibly do justice to the occasion unless the date was postponed at least until November 19 to permit him adequate time for preparation. Wills acceded to this request and immediately began to issue invitations to generals, congressmen, statesmen and even to the President of the United States.

That invitation bears some scrutiny. It may be the only invitation in the world which is bronzed on a plaque for the world to see. It is certainly the only invitation in the world to share equal space with what most of us believe to be the greatest speech ever given. There is some thought that the invitation was extended as an afterthought and that it was somewhat demeaning to ask the President to make a few appropriate remarks rather than inviting him to be the main speaker. Considering the wisdom of Mr. Wills, which was demonstrated in the way he handled his other tasks, I suggest that the invitation was extended out of deference to the President who had many important things to do besides preparing a speech. A close look at the invitation will reveal that in both length and substance the President's remarks responded to the invitation precisely. Permit me to read this excerpt from the invitation which appears at the Lincoln Speech Memorial in the National Cemetery at Gettysburg:

"The several states having soldiers in the Army of the Potomac who were killed at the Battle of Gettysburg or who have since died at the various hospitals which were established in the vicinity have procured grounds on a prominent part of the battlefield for a cemetery and are having the dead removed to them and properly buried. These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose on the 19th instant. It is the desire that you as chief executive of the nation formally set apart these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks. It will be a source of great gratification to the many widows and orphans that have been made almost friendless by the great battle here to have you here personally and it will kindle anew in the breasts of the comrades of these brave dead who are now in the tented field notably meeting the foe in the front a confidence that they who sleep in death on the battlefield are not forgotten by the highest in authority and they will feel that should their fate be the same, their remains will not be uncared for."

President Abraham Lincoln could not refuse an invitation extended with such sincerity and which appealed to his deepest feelings. His compassion for the widows, the orphans and the men in battle on both sides of the battle line has been well described by historians and authors. Somehow this man would fit into this busy schedule a few appropriate remarks if it would do anything at all to ameliorate the grief of his fellow citizens and rekindle the vision of their forefathers about this nation's unique structure and purpose. Therefore, in the early evening of November 18, the President arrived by train in Gettysburg on schedule. On November 19, at the time previously designated, he was in his appointed place for the military parade saddled on a horse his own stature dwarfed. The parade was delayed to await Mr. Everett's arrival. At the rostrum in the cemetery Mr. Lincoln was in his place at the appointed time while the crowd waited restlessly for Mr. Everett.

(Let me pause here for some personal reflections. Looking over this audience I know that some of you are speechmakers. I know that most of you, like your speaker today, have had to prepare your remarks in your spare time. I know that some of you, like your speaker today, often must apologize for lack of preparation and cite a busy schedule as a valid reason therefor. Now with that in mind I have tried, without any success, to place myself in the position of the President of the United States in 1863, making the daily decisions which are necessarily a part of that high office (none of which are routine), running a war without the benefit of expert military advice or personal training, trying to maintain some semblance of family stability in the most abnormal of conditions and then attempting to find time to prepare a "few appropriate remarks" knowing full well that whatever he said would be most assuredly compared with the speech of the nation's foremost orator. Could he be equal to such a task—could any human being be equal to such a task?)

We know approximately what time he retired the night of the 18th. What we don't know is how much he slept, if at all. No wonder he looked "sad," "tired" and "weary" the morning of the 19th. The train ride from Washington would have been enough to make him appear that way. However, I suggest that the train ride was of no consequence. His genuine concern was to say the right thing, to be worthy of the occasion, to speak as citizens would expect their President to speak and to find the words that would bring comfort to the bereaved.

The crowd had already been standing for more than 3 hours when he arose to speak at the rostrum. One thing about his speech that impressed some of those who were present, wrote William Barton, was Lincoln's intonation. "They had not thought of him as a native of Kentucky, but his pronunciation showed his origin. Speaking very slowly he tended to exaggerate, if anything, his native intonation. He pronounced the preposition 'to' as if it were written 'tee.' He passed lightly over the sound of the letter 'R.' When he spoke of 'our poor power' he showed his Kentucky idiom in every word. The prairies had done something for him but most of his Illinois neighbors were of Kentucky stock. The President talked as they talked."

There are nearly as many versions of how the speech was received by the crowd as there are versions of when and where and how many times he wrote it. One stenographer who was assigned to record it in shorthand (because the President seldom spoke from notes) was so overwhelmed by Lincoln's words and his manner of delivery that he failed to record the latter half of the speech in its entirety!

No matter how the crowd responded, the

press was almost unanimous in adverse criticism. Few of the city papers had any complimentary remarks for the President or his speech. There were some notable exceptions. An unidentified reporter (isn't that part of the irony of life) for the Chicago Tribune proved to be one of the few prophets listening. He wrote, "The dedicatory remarks of Mr. Lincoln will live among the annals of man." The Providence Journal noted, "It is often said that the hardest thing in the world is to make a five minute speech. But could the most elaborate and splendid oration be more beautiful, more touching, more inspiring than those thrilling words of the President?" Harper's Weekly said, "The few words of the President were from the heart to the heart. It was as simple and felicitous and earnest a word as was ever spoken."

The events of November 19, 1863, did not end at the speaker's platform for Mr. Lincoln. His long delayed luncheon with Mr. Wills, his host during his stay in Gettysburg, was hardly consumed until he had to endure a public reception. Keeping on schedule, his next appointment was to attend a patriotic ceremony at the Presbyterian Church in the company of Gettysburg's sole participant in the battle, one John Burns, a 70 year old constable who took musket in hand to aid the Union forces, and was wounded in the battle. Lincoln's departure time compelled him to leave that service prior to its termination.

Finally, he was on his way back to Washington. It was another long journey. One can imagine his thoughts. Had he said the right thing, had he come anywhere close to Everett's monumental effort? Then to bed. Barton writes again in truth, "A speaker's inspiration does not cease with the platform. When the tumult and shouting have died and the speaker is alone in bed, weary and perhaps ashamed of himself, he is very likely to rehearse his speech and think of the things he ought to have said. That is what drives orators wild. . . . The clock strikes again and again while the orator wearily rehearses the speech he wishes he had made."

On the morning of November 20, Abraham Lincoln was ill. He remained in bed for several days with an ailment diagnosed as varicella. More time to rehearse what he wished he would have said at Gettysburg! He was frank to state to a few close associates that he had not done well at Gettysburg. He certainly didn't impress the pastor of the Presbyterian Church who conducted the patriotic ceremony following the services in the cemetery. The author Barton, writes that copies of the good pastor's eulogy of Lincoln delivered after his assassination did not mention the speech he had made here, and, in fact, did not even mention that Lincoln had occupied a pew in the very church where the minister was preaching. In all fairness to Reverend Carnahan, we must admit that he was not the first learned man nor will he be the last who miss the obvious and embellish the obscure.

Time has treated the few words spoken here by Lincoln much more kindly, of course. Lord Curzon, Chancellor of Oxford in the early 1900's when asked to identify the supreme masterpieces of English eloquence, cited Pitt's toast after the battle of Trafalgar and two of Abraham Lincoln's speeches—the second inaugural address and the Gettysburg address. Of the latter, Lord Curzon said, "It joined the local to the national, the occasional to the permanent; it went straight at the declaration of purpose which animated the soul of Lincoln and for which the men buried at Gettysburg had given their lives."

From the moment after the words were uttered until the present, scholars, historians and even judges have explored, interpreted and probed the speech for its deepest meanings. Just a few months ago a scholarly article entitled "Reflections—The Gettysburg Address" appeared in the New Yorker maga-



zine. Written by Mortimer J. Adler and William Gorman, the article claimed to pinpoint the source and purpose of each word and phrase. The article concluded with these words, "If the idea of democracy became at this nation's birth something the nation regarded itself as holding in trust for the world and for the future, and if Lincoln's oracular triad of prepositional phrases (government of, by and for the people) indeed epitomizes that idea, then we have been right in regarding Lincoln's last 16 words as the focal point of the American testament."

There can be no doubt that Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on November 19, 1863 was the right man at the right place at the right time. No other mortal in God's world could have said what he said here. However, if he were living today, he would probably disavow any such acclamation, but I do suggest that he would be pleased to see a Kentucky coffee tree implanted not 100 yards distant from where he spoke.

I close with these words from Alistair Cooke's appraisal of Lincoln in his wonderful book, "America." "We know that he steeped himself in the subtleties of Shakespeare, the cadences of the Bible and the hard humanity of Robert Burns. And somehow, and conspicuously during the war, he became what he always must have been: a shrewd, honorable frontiersman of very great gifts. Not the least of these was his ability to express a hard unsentimental truth in the barest language every tinker and tailor could understand. He exemplified better than any statesman until Churchill the Churchillian line, 'the short words are the best, and the old words are the best of all.'"

**STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONGRESS TO CONTINUE REVENUE SHARING BEYOND THE PROPOSED JUNE 1, 1976, TERMINATION DATE, ON JANUARY 29, 1976**

**HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN**  
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island General Assembly on January 16, 1976, memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to continue the policy or revenue sharing beyond the proposed June 1, 1976, termination date.

**RESOLUTION: MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONGRESS TO CONTINUE THE POLICY OF REVENUE SHARING BEYOND THE PROPOSED JUNE 1, 1976, TERMINATION DATE**

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States and the Congress be and they are hereby respectfully requested to take the appropriate steps necessary to continue the policy of revenue sharing beyond June 1, 1976; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be

and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Congress, the President, and the senatorial and congressional delegation from Rhode Island serving in Congress.

PANAMA

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ben F. Meyer, a specialist in Latin American affairs who served with the Associated Press for 41 years, had a column recently in the Arkansas Gazette of December 12 which was forwarded to me.

It concerns the question of Panama and gives some background that I think is important for people to be aware of.

His column follows:

**U.S. UNDER PRESSURE ON PANAMA QUESTION**  
(By Ben F. Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—A bright new member of Congress from Illinois says "the Panama Canal issue will plague this Congress, this nation and this hemisphere until we come to a fair settlement with Panama."

Although these views put Representative Paul Simon in a minority in Congress, where there is widespread opposition to eventual control of the Canal by Panama, U.S. officials are pleading for a better undertaking of the problem.

Representative Simon says "We very much need a new treaty. We cannot longer ignore the fact that colonialism is dead and that the present arrangement sorely needs modernization."

Tremendous pressure is building up for an agreement with Panama. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, one of this country's most skilled negotiators, hopes Congress can be persuaded to support a new treaty, once it is worked out with Panama. Much of the present opposition to an agreement, Bunker says, "stems from false impressions and myths."

"We do not own the Canal Zone, a 50-mile strip 10 miles wide which cuts across the heartland of Panama, dividing the nation in two. We did not buy it, as we did Alaska or Louisiana. The \$10 million dollars we sent to Panama in 1903 was not to buy territory, but rights."

Panama's unhappiness with the treaty has produced riots in that country, unceasing attacks on the United States in Latin America and angry criticisms of Washington by Third World countries, recently flexing their muscles—and their vocal chords—in international forums.

The last riot, in January, 1964, gave Lyndon B. Johnson, only recently become president, his first major international problem. Johnson acted swiftly to get negotiations under way. After three years the two countries announced, on June 26, 1967, agreement on three draft treaties. They gave Panama so little, however, that its government did not submit them for legislative approval. Neither did the White House.

Not surprisingly, U.S. officials deny reports that the canal question has been shelved until after the U.S. presidential elections November, 1976. But the current negotiations actually began June 29, 1971 and the complexities of an eventual pull-out of the canal operation, what to do with 13 military bases, about 10,000 military men, 29,000 civilian employees and their families in the Canal Zone, and 6,000 U.S. citizens living in Panama, and a satisfactory operation of the canal are not issues settled easily.

Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, chief of government of Panama, says the canal problem is so urgent that the United States should come to a speedy solution in its own interest. Bunker agrees. Yet Gen. Torrijos seems less concerned about the time needed to achieve a solution than about the sincerity of the U.S. Congress in desiring a fair settlement.

When a little nation is struggling for its liberation, the important thing is not so much a year or two longer to obtain a solution, if a solution is in prospect he says, Panama seems to trust Bunker, 81, but active, alert and hard working.

Internationally, the United States is on the spot. It used gunboat diplomacy in 1903 to obtain a document saying it had the right to build the canal and to operate and defend it "in perpetuity." But the whole transaction was such a shady deal that John Hay, then Secretary of State, termed the treaty "vastly advantageous to the United States and, we must confess, not so advantageous to Panama."

Actually both countries need a settlement. Panama could put the canal out of business with a few sticks of dynamite, but it would put Panama's economy out of business too. Most of its income comes from the canal.

**TAMPERING WITH NATION'S SECURITY**

**HON. RAY ROBERTS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an excellent editorial concerning the CIA. It appeared in the February 1976 issue of the Torch, the monthly publication of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. The editor of this outstanding veterans' publication is also an officer of the organization and had much personal experience during both World War I and II regarding the issue of releasing information regarding our national security. He is Harold B. Say, who is presently the legislative director of this organization.

I commend this article to the attention of all Members of the House regarding a subject of intense interest to all Americans:

**TAMPERING WITH NATION'S SECURITY**

What would have happened if some bright media man obsessed with the conviction he was bound to tell the world all he knew had ascertained General Eisenhower's date for assaulting the Germans in Normandy and promptly announced it to the world? Surprise was a major key in the success of the June 6 landings.

Best hindsight is if such divulgence had been made the assault would have failed.

The tight lock of security and censorship would have thwarted any irresponsible or traitorous purveyor of such vital information. And the man attempting to get such prohibited material out to the world would have been shot or locked up for keeps.

We thought back on this and other critical elements of information of World War I and II when we read the stories on the workings of the FBI and CIA recently. True, they are not in the same class, but they are on the same line.

We have no brief for illegal or obvious wrong doings of government agencies. But we do have the conviction that for good standing of the United States among nations of the world and for the continued effective-

ness of our agencies charged with protecting our country's security that a clean up can be effected without hanging out our dirty laundry for the world to see.

Gathering of intelligence including espionage is essential. It cannot be accomplished if our agents have to wear identifying tags around their necks. Yet some of the media people seem to think that in effect is exactly what they should do.

This philosophy resulted in the murder of one conscientious CIA man in Greece recently. He may not be the last to pay with his life for irresponsible divulgence of secret information. Sad as is the untimely death of one agent, the real long range damage is the undermining of agencies charged with intelligence operations.

Again, let us clean up internally where cleaning is needed; get offenders off the government payroll; put competent, trustworthy men in their places. But don't wreck an essential arm of a great nation.

#### THE BURN FACILITIES ACT OF 1975

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is presently pending before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment an important measure, H.R. 8438, the Burn Facilities Act of 1975, which is identical to the measure I have cosponsored, H.R. 10265. The proposed legislation establishes 36 "burn centers" and "burn units" providing research, training, treatment, and rehabilitation for burn injury patients. Too many unnecessary burn injury deaths have occurred due to the absence of specialized burn care facilities.

Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the distinguished Subcommittee on Health and Environment, urging its prompt action on this measure. I insert my remarks at this point in the Record for my colleagues consideration and, hopefully, for their support:

I welcome this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment to testify on the sorely needed measure, H.R. 8438, the Burn Facilities Act of 1975, which is identical to the measure I have cosponsored, H.R. 10265. Mr. Chairman, I commend you and the other members of this distinguished committee for your concern in this vital area and for scheduling these hearings.

The three tier thrust of H.R. 8438 is: (1) to establish 12 additional "burn centers" specializing in research, teaching, and the treatment of burn injuries, (2) to provide 24 additional "burn units" providing specialized facilities in general hospitals, and (3) to upgrade the "burn program" in general hospitals having no specialized facilities for burn care but containing a consistent plan for the management of burn patients and implemented by experienced physicians.

Of the more than 6,000 general hospitals in the United States, less than 100 are capable of providing specialized burn care. Of the 100 hospitals that do treat burn patients, very few—I do not have the exact figure—are "burn centers" capable of providing research, training, and the specialized patient care. Moreover, many of these hospitals treating burn patients in intensive care supervision are limited to only a few beds. . . . Some of our larger topnotch hospitals treat-

ing burn patients have less than eight beds. I have been informed that within the definitions of the proposed legislation before you today there is not one "burn center" in the entire State of New York. Our closest resource is Boston.

One of my unfortunate constituents who recently received severe burns found that while his local hospital care was excellent, it was not equipped to handle any major burn complication. In his crucial time of need, the facilities in Boston were unavailable to him and this critically burned patient had to be flown to the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas.

Only last Friday, a 15-month old baby from the adjoining Congressional district in Sullivan County in N.Y. State received burn injuries covering 50% of her body. That child's condition still remains critical. Again, there was no local hospital facility capable of providing adequate care.

Underscoring this deplorable lack of medical care is the grim statistic that every year more than 600 individuals from New York State die from burns. I have been told that there is not one major medical center in New York State equipped to handle burn injuries on a large scale, not one burn center able to train the specialists, to treat and rehabilitate the patients, and to perform research on these injuries. With the burn centers and burn units provided in the proposed legislation, many of these deaths could have been avoided.

Only a few hospitals throughout the Nation are properly equipped for treating burn victims, and most of these hospitals can accommodate only a few patients. The necessity for establishing burn centers and burn units is obvious and urgent. The legislation before this committee is crucial for preventing any further unnecessary deaths resulting from burn injuries. There is a dire need for research, training, treatment, and for rehabilitation. Unfortunately, this type of medical specialty is extremely expensive, the average cost reportedly being 40% higher than treatment for other medical and surgical intensive care patients. This is attributed to complications arising from the extensive loss of skin tissue, which impair the internal bodily systems and which tax the heart, lungs and kidneys which are burdened with overcoming the traumatic shock of first, second, and third degree burns.

There are, however, some exciting developments in the area of burn treatment that I would like briefly to share with members of the committee. Underscoring the urgency of the needs for these facilities, some of our citizens have taken the initiative in waging war on this health problem.

Last June, volunteer firemen's associations from Orange, Ulster, and Sullivan counties established the Fire Fighters Burn Treatment Fund to try to raise \$500,000 to establish a major regional burn treatment center for all burn victims. To date, our upstate firefighters, working with community leaders in business, industry, and labor have raised over \$100,000. They have received the support of more than 200,000 New York State paid and volunteer firemen. The Times Herald Record, a daily newspaper in Middletown, New York, under the leadership of its publisher, R. John Van Kleek, and fund coordinator, Charles Crist, has generated community-wide enthusiasm for this program. The hard work of these dedicated citizens is beginning to yield substantial results.

But not all communities are fortunate to have this kind of impetus and, more importantly, the costs of such a project are high. After all, there are limits on fund raising capabilities.

Last year, Congress passed the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 establishing a National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control. Mr. Chairman, in the interests of enhancing fire fighting, your committee's

action on H.R. 8438 is a logical extension of the 1974 act. The provisions of this measure are intended to benefit not only fire fighters, but all fire victims.

Editorializing the need for regional burn centers, the Middletown Times Herald Record, on May 5, 1975, stated:

"Congress and state legislatures appear to have been negligent in providing necessary funds and specialized hospital burn care treatment services.

"Unwilling to wait for government to act, the firefighters of New York have launched a drive for funds to develop a highly specialized burn treatment center. . . .

"Death from any cause is a tragedy. An avoidable death is the greater tragedy. It is, in fact, a crime."

"Mr. Chairman, I thank you and members of this committee for focusing attention on this vital problem and I urge the favorable consideration of my colleagues for this important measure.

#### SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kissinger appeared this morning on Capitol Hill finally to state for the public record the administration's reasoning for involving this country in a remote civil war in Angola. Reportedly, our aid has been flowing to the underground for years and was sharply increased a full year ago.

Occasionally there may be legitimate reasons for the covert nature of some of our most sensitive foreign policies, but it should be recognized in the balance that on significant and controversial matters the public has a countervailing need to know. This is especially true when an involvement holds out the possibility of deepening—to the point where, when it is revealed, Congress suddenly finds itself confronting something that has assumed the sacred aura of a commitment. Because of bureaucratic inertia and our often valid concerns of prestige and the appearance of resolve, commitments are difficult to reverse.

There was once hope that the Ryan-Hughes amendment would prevent Congress from being boxed in. There is now fear that it has aggravated, rather than solved, the problem. Senator DICK CLARK addressed this issue from painful personal experience in today's New York Times.

If we are to put Angola behind us, we must avoid other Angolas that lurk in front of us. I commend Senator CLARK's article to my colleagues as we begin to explore ideas for making the formulating of our foreign policy more democratic.

The article follows:

FRUSTRATION

(By DICK CLARK)

WASHINGTON.—Recent disclosures of our year-long involvement in the Angolan civil war raises serious questions about Congressional oversight of foreign policy, particularly the conduct of covert operations.

Administration leaders argue that Congress was given an oversight role in covert



operations when an amendment sponsored by Senator Harold Hughes and Representative Leo Ryan passed in December 1974. Actually, the matter is much more complex. The amendment provides for nothing more than an ex-post-facto communication to Congress of decisions already reached. There is still nothing in existing law giving Congress a voice in covert operations; there is no provision for advice or consent.

Indeed, classified briefings actually become an impediment to effective oversight. Once the information is made available, there is no way the Congress can properly use it to oppose or influence policy without taking public action. Congress is saddled with the illusion of co-responsibility for the covert action without having any say in the decision. This is the worst of all possible arrangements.

I found out how inhibiting the possession of classified material can be during hearings held before the African Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As subcommittee chairman, I had asked for and received a briefing late in July on our covert activities in Angola. A short time later in public hearings the then Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, Nathaniel Davis, asked not to be pressed on certain points because, as he indicated in a note passed to me, "we both know" about these covert activities. Therefore, I was cautious in my questioning. Had I not had the classified briefing, I could have proceeded on the basis of newspaper reports with much more vigorous questioning, which would have put a more honest statement of United States policy into the record.

Later, in an effort to express objection to what I considered an unwise involvement in a tribal war in Angola, I asked Deputy Secretary of State Robert S. Ingersoll at a closed session of the subcommittee to explain United States policy. The objections were ignored.

Determined to get a first-hand view of the situation in Angola and southern Africa, I traveled there during the August recess and talked with the heads of each of the three Angolan liberation factions plus the heads of state in Zambia, Zaïre and Tanzania, and the South African foreign minister. I returned convinced that our involvement was a mistake, could only end in embarrassment, and could only impede the development of the rational African policy we need.

Upon returning I met with the Director of Central Intelligence, William E. Colby, told him what I had learned, and registered my discord with United States policy. To no avail. Later in the month I learned that the Administration had doubled the funding for military equipment to pro-Western Angolan factions.

In frustration, I went to the full Foreign Relations Committee, reported on my trip and explained my objections. The committee called Mr. Colby and Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger for a complete review of Angolan and African policy.

When they appeared—with Under Secretary Joseph J. Sisco sitting in for Mr. Kissinger—many of us expressed doubts about the deepening involvement. But the warnings went unheeded. Within a month the Administration had decided to significantly increase our covert commitment for the fourth time in four months.

Having tried to oppose this policy through every avenue available to me within established channels, I took the only course remaining—I offered an amendment to the pending Security Assistance Act to prevent any funds from being spent in Angola without specific Congressional approval. This brought our concern, though not the secret details, out into the public.

Subsequently, the Senate passed an

amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act that barred further funds in that bill for intervention in Angola. The House on Tuesday accepted the same restriction. My amendment, broader in that it would bar all expenditures in any category, is in the bill about to go to the Senate.

The Angolan experience convinces me—and I believe the majority of my colleagues—of the inadequacy of the present oversight system. It does not allow for Congressional consultation or veto. In practice, access to classified information after a decision has been reached and action initiated becomes in itself a restriction on a member's action and leaves no alternative for influencing policy except to go public through legislative action.

I am convinced that the nation is better served by not conducting covert military or political activities (as opposed to information collection, which I support). But Congressional and public sentiment probably does not support that view. Thus it is vital that in the restructuring of its oversight apparatus the Congress define for itself a more responsible and unambiguous role in covert activities.

#### PARENS PATRIAE LEGISLATION

#### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, those interested in Chairman Rodino's position on the parens patriae legislation should welcome a chance to read the speech he gave to the Grocery Manufacturers of America last November 19:

ADDRESS OF CHAIRMAN RODINO TO GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC., NOVEMBER 19, 1975

This morning you have asked me to discuss the priorities of the House Judiciary Committee on antitrust matters. As I do, I hope that you will understand that I do not come here to lay before you the dictates of the Congress. Instead, I want to say at the beginning that I believe we both have an important mutual interest in the field of antitrust.

I see that virtually every major producer of food products in the country is represented here. Most of you are not insulated in the corporate offices; you are face to face with the public and press each day.

And from these encounters you know firsthand the suspicion, distrust and animosity with which large segments of the public today view so-called big business, including the conglomerates of the food industry.

I come from another group that often is held in something less than admiration by the public; Congress, the Federal Government. Sadly, much of the public has concluded that politicians and businessmen are cast in the same mold of expediency and self-interest.

Are these images of us false ones? Are we the victims of bad press and unfair judgments? In general, I don't think so. The traumatic events of the last two years have shown to my satisfaction, and I think to yours as well, that the public is far more perceptive than any of us may have imagined.

The people of this Nation have put us all on notice that they will have little patience with anything less than honesty and integrity. They realize that government and business share a single obligation: to serve the public interest.

This principle is clearly evident in the field

of antitrust legislation and enforcement. The antitrust laws of the United States comprise the principal rulebook of the marketplace.

They are designed to protect both business and the consumer, promoting a climate that is competitive, profitable, and as free from Government intervention as possible.

I don't think any of us is satisfied that this is the case now. Businesses complain bitterly about the mass of bureaucratic Government paper that burdens them. Consumers protest uneven quality and unstable prices that seem to rise of their own volition without control or competition. Shareholders and boards of directors demand greater profits.

And beneath this all runs the current of public opinion: Business and Government are corrupt, irresponsible. The past three years have produced little evidence to convince the public that its dollars invested in business and Government are going to good use.

Money is wasted and misspent while prices go higher. Yesterday, the Washington Post quoted a Library of Congress report saying that American corporations had paid out bribes, kickbacks and contributions here and abroad of at least 300 million dollars in the past few years. Citizens reading this might justifiably draw some skeptical conclusions about the freedom of the American marketplace.

I was heartened, however, by another newspaper story yesterday in the Wall Street Journal. Michael Blumenthal, president of Bendix Corporation, and other business leaders have begun exploring the possibility of a code of ethics for American business. Whether their effort bears fruit or not, the concern they are showing for the responsibility of business is encouraging.

I would find it difficult to quarrel with those who advocate a similar undertaking by those of us in Government, because public faith, so easily lost, is not quickly regained. If your purchasers and our voters are to once again have confidence in us, it will be only because we have earned it.

The antitrust field may offer one of the finest opportunities that either of us has. Here we must demonstrate that the imbalances in the marketplace can be corrected by responsible business and responsible Government. It is not a question of punishing or penalizing any segment of industry or any group of consumers.

It is an obligation as incumbent upon business as it is upon Government: To examine carefully and prudently the myriad problems that beset our economy. If legislation is needed, we of the Congress will enact it. If better, more balanced enforcement is required, we will demand it.

But I can assure you of this: The Judiciary Committee will be fair, thorough and careful in its work. However, it will move with persistence once it reaches a conclusion.

And it is your responsibility to provide us with the facts and opinions that will aid in our deliberations. Your obligation is as great as ours. The public will no more tolerate the business that creates questionable statistics to justify anti-competitive practices than it will the congressional committee that tries to substitute rhetoric for action.

There is no doubt that on many occasions, and on many points, we will disagree. But if dispute is inevitable, it need not be destructive or bitter.

I am sure, however, that on one thing we would agree—there has not been for many years a close examination of the antitrust statutes, their enforcement and effect. We plan to furnish this oversight to give us an overall picture of antitrust policy in the United States, its successes, shortcomings and imbalances.

There are, of course, many imbalances, both in the marketplace and in the law, about which we are already well informed.

The Federal Trade Commission has identified 17 major areas of food production where monopolistic overcharges cost consumers more than 2½ billion dollars a year. If meat packing plants are added to this, the total climbs to more than 3 billion dollars.

Such concentrated imbalances cannot be ignored. If there is no willingness by industry to permit improved competition in the areas of soft drinks, soaps, canned goods, bakery products and the like, then the Congress, and in particular the judiciary committee, may have no alternative but to act.

The Justice Department has also been impressed with the lack of competition in many of these areas. In recent years it has brought lawsuits alleging price-fixing in the bread and bakery industries in Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, Chicago and San Diego. Similar charges have been filed against the milk industry in Washington, Wyoming and Alaska, against the soft drink industry in Tulsa and sugar refiners nationally.

These actions have reflected the department's interest in protecting competition, but they have also brought home the need for improved enforcement in the antitrust field at the local level.

To correct this legal imbalance, the Judiciary Committee in July approved the *parens patriae* bill with the support of the Justice Department. The House Rules Committee decided recently not to schedule the bill for house debate, but the measure certainly is not dead. I intend to go before the Rules Committee again at the appropriate time and urge that the bill be sent to the floor for action.

*Parens patriae* would permit state attorneys general to bring suit in Federal Court on behalf of their citizens injured by antitrust violations. Such authority not only would protect consumers against arbitrary practices but would stimulate competition to the benefit of business itself.

Recently, Thomas Kauper, assistant attorney general for the Antitrust Division, wrote me in support of the bill. He had this to say: "The *parens patriae* concept, as embodied in H.R. 8532, is both desirable and useful from the perspective of better antitrust enforcement. Such a provision is also consistent with the enforcement goals of the Clayton Act."

There have been published reports that the business roundtable conducted a well-organized lobbying effort to block the bill in the Rules Committee. If so, I question whether it really served the public's interest.

Opponents of *Parens Patriae* argue that it will result in frivolous lawsuits. I cannot accept that. State attorneys general are responsible for protecting the interest of their constituents, businessmen as well as consumers. Their duty is clear and I reject the notion that they will not exercise it judiciously.

Another imbalance in the law will be corrected when the Congress repeals the so-called Fair Trade Enabling Acts. Earlier this year the Judiciary Committee reported and the House overwhelmingly approved the repeal. On the House floor, the bill was superbly managed by Representative Barbara Jordan of Texas, who outlined to the satisfaction of all sides the anticompetitive aspects of the old laws.

Repeal of these outdated statutes may be the single most effective action the Congress can take to prevent inflation in some areas of the economy. Although I am pleased with the action of the House, I cannot claim that the idea originated with us. At least 15 States have repealed their fair trade laws, including those in my own State of New Jersey. Today, fewer than 30 States have such statutes.

Other possible areas of legal imbalance are under examination. The House Small Business subcommittee is studying the Robin-

son-Patman Act of 1936 which has troubled many in business and government.

The Department of Justice has recommended either repeal or amendment of the act. The Judiciary Committee has taken no position on this matter, but it is receiving the close attention of our staff attorneys.

There are some proposals that I believe would aggravate, rather than correct, existing imbalances. One of these is the so-called "bottlers bill" that would create special exemptions for manufacturers of soft drinks and private-label food products.

The recent decision of an FTC administrative law judge has virtually mooted this legislation. I believe, as I have said publicly before, the courts are the proper arena to settle such disputes, and it would be unwise for the Congress to write such exemptions into law.

This brings me to one of the most perplexing and crucial problems of both industry and consumer: Energy.

The American Food Industry, the most efficient and stable in the world, consumes a disproportionately small percentage of the Nation's total energy. Yet by 1980, the consumption of energy by the industry is expected to increase 19 percent over 1971.

As energy costs move inexorably upward, industry has no alternative but to pass them on to the consumer.

Whether this spiral can be broken is very much in question, but the Judiciary Committee intends to find out. We recently held hearings on the vertical integration of the petroleum industry and we intend to hold more later this year and early in 1976.

We have received excellent cooperation from most segments of the oil industry. But one witness before the committee suggested that Congress was approaching this subject with a punitive legislative attitude.

I feel that these remarks were unfounded. I regret this unnecessary conflict over a subject that is far too important to be clouded with emotional judgments. The committee has a clear obligation to inquire into the structure of the oil industry, just as it has an equally clear responsibility to examine other aspects of the antitrust field.

The lack of competition, whether it be in petroleum products or food, is ample cause for scrutiny by both the legislative and executive branches. Unnecessary costs to consumers caused by imbalances in the marketplace damage not only the individual but business as well.

The judiciary committee has earned a reputation for fairness and propriety that I am committed to uphold. We will investigate, but we are eager to hear the opinions and evidence of all sides. This is not an all-or-nothing battle. It is an effort to promote the economic well-being of the nation, keeping always in mind the need for a free and responsible business community.

Today, we need another community as well, a community of purpose to resolve such problems as these.

What you, as businessmen and women, and we, as politicians, do and say in the future will determine whether our mutual constituents reinvest their faith in us, or turn away, convinced that our 200-year old experiment in democracy has been a failure.

## 200 YEARS AGO TODAY

### HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on January 29, 1776, Congress

demonstrated its complete confidence in Washington by declaring his action to be, "prudent, consistent with his duty, and a further manifestation of his commendable zeal for the good of his country" when he requested the colonies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire to each raise a regiment for service in Canada immediately after he received word of the disaster at Quebec. He then wrote to the President of the Continental Congress explaining his action. Washington stressed that he had written to the colonies, without first receiving authorization from the Congress, because he felt that it was essential to raise the needed forces without delay. He added that if Congress thought his action unwise, it should countermand his request.

## JESSICA SMITH: FIVE DECADES OF SERVICE TO THE SOVIETS

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a luncheon in tribute to Jessica Smith Ware Abt will be held in New York City on Sunday, February 1, 1976, in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Roosevelt at noon. The affair will honor Miss Smith on the occasion of her 80th birthday and her 40th year as editor of Communist magazines extolling the virtues of the Soviet Union and the Red Army.

According to an adulatory profile of Jessica Smith entitled "The Most Important Job in the World," by Joseph North, the Communist Party, U.S.A.'s former Moscow correspondent in the World magazine supplement to the CPUSA newspapers, Miss Smith's revolutionary work began "with her feeling of exultation when word came that the workers and peasants had taken power in Russia on November 7, 1917." Wrote North:

She was among the first to hear John Reed's eyewitness account of the ten days that shook the world, and his report-back roused her to go and see for herself. She set to work arranging mass meetings so that many other Americans could hear Reed and another eye witness, Albert Rhys Williams.

North's article continued:

By 1922, Ms. Smith herself made her way to the USSR with the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers) to help alleviate \* \* \* the famine \* \* \*. She is one of the few foreigners in the world today who heard V. I. Lenin speak—at the Comintern Congress in 1922, where she was a Federated Press correspondent.

Joe North's article confirms several interesting historical points: first, that Jessica Smith was holding responsible Communist Party and Comintern positions by 1922. Federated Press was a Communist front news service and propaganda organ. North's article also serves to indicate how long term is the Communist penetration of the American



Friends Service Committee, an organization which is now spearheading the shipment of light industry supplies to the Vietnamese Communists.

Jessica Smith on her return to the United States married into one of the Communist Party's leading dynasties, becoming the wife of Harold Ware, a son of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, who served on the CPUSA National Committee for decades. Smith and Ware, under the direction of the Comintern, worked to infiltrate American agriculture; and they received a letter of thanks from Lenin himself for their organizing delegations of agricultural experts and shipments of modern tractors and equipment to the infant Bolshevik regime.

In the early 1930's, Ware was assigned to establish Communist espionage cells in U.S. Government agencies in Washington, D.C. Members of the Ware group included Nathan Witt; Alger Hiss and his brother, Donald Hiss; Lee Pressman; Henry Collins; Charles Kramer; Victor Perlo, now head of CPUSA's Economics Commission; and John J. Abt, now general counsel to the CPUSA and a member of its Political Commission. After Ware's death in the mid-1930's, Jessica Smith married John Abt, and she has shown a continuing association with the surviving members of the Ware group.

Jessica Smith herself has also been identified as a member of the CPUSA, serving on its national committee since the late 1930's. In 1936 she became editor of Soviet Russia Today, and in 1951 became editor of that magazine's successor, New World Review. Among the staff of New World Review is David Zimmerman, also known as Dan Mason, a member of the CPUSA History Committee. Zimmerman, under the alias of David Carpenter, was a courier for the Alger Hiss Soviet spy ring in the State Department.

Speakers at the tribute luncheon are to include:

Gus Hall, CPUSA general secretary.

John J. Abt, CPUSA political commission and general counsel.

Nadine Brewer, Metropolitan Opera singer.

Abe Feinglass, CPUSA member; vice president, Amalgamated Meatcutters & Butcher Workmen's Union.

Valentin M. Kamenev.

Anatoly A. Mkrtychyan, editor of Soviet Life, an official propaganda publication of the U.S.S.R.

Richard Morford, CPUSA member; a leader of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, a leading CPUSA front.

John Randolph, CPUSA member and actor.

Augusta Strong, CPUSA member.

Pete Seeger, a folksinger active in innumerable CPUSA causes and fronts since the 1940's.

Chairwoman of the tribute luncheon will be Thelma Dale Perkins.

The tribute committee, operating not surprisingly from the New World Review offices at 156 Fifth Avenue, room 308, New York, N.Y. 10010, 212/CH 3-0666, includes such well-known CPUSA members and supporters of its fronts as:

Marilyn Bechtel, associate editor, New York Review.

Alan Howard, national office, Chile Solidarity Committee.

Josh Kornbluth.

Max Kurz, U.S. Committee for Friendship with the German Democratic Republic, a CPUSA front in support of the East Germans which was developed from a study group at Columbia University in the late 1960's.

Tony Monteiro, CPUSA and Young Workers Liberation League leader who now serves as executive secretary of another CPUSA front for support of Marxist-Leninist guerrilla movements in Southern Africa, the National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity with Africa Liberation (NAIMSAL).

George B. Murphy, Jr., an aged CPUSA member and writer for the Afro-American newspaper chain active in many CPUSA fronts such as the American-Korean Friendship and Information Center.

Muriel Neuberger.

Nilsa Pietri.

Pauline Royce Rosen, CPUSA member and U.S. coordinator of the U.S. sector of the World Peace Council, an international Soviet-controlled Communist front.

Daniel Rosenberg.

James Steele, head of CPUSA's youth group, the Young Workers Liberation League (YWLL).

Dorothy Steffens, executive director of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), an organization and an individual who work closely with domestic and international Communist fronts and causes, including the Peoples' Coalition for Peace and Justice, the World Peace Council and the Women's International Democratic Federation.

Hy Wallach.

The Jessica Smith Anniversary Committee numbers nearly 100 persons and is a rollcall of leading U.S. Communist and front activists. They include:

#### ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

John J. Abt, Michael Balanoff, Vita Barsky, Minna Bayer, Marilyn Bechtel, Jane Benedict, Constance E. Berkley.

Harry Bridges, Alva Buxenbaum, Marvel Cooke, Eleanor Crain, Irving J. Crain, M.D., Ernest Crichlow, Angela Davis, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Ernest De Maio.

Freda Diamond, Robert W. Dunn, Ethel Ellis (Mrs. Fred Ellis), Stephen H. Fritchman, Judy Gallo, Simon W. Gerson, Sophie M. Gerson, Sally Gorton, Sara Gottlieb, Harry Gottlieb, Gilbert Green, Helen North Green, Maurine A. Green.

William Gropper, Robert Gwathmey, Lem Harris, Peter K. Hawley, Carroll Hollister, Dorothy K. Hunton, Esther Cooper Jackson, James E. Jackson, Arnold Johnson, David B. Kimmelman, M.D., Edythe Kimmelman, David Laibman, Edward Lamb, Corliss Lamont, John Howard Lawson.

Susan E. Lawson, Clara K. Leet, C. Robert Leet, Walter Lowenfels, Dorothy Lumer, Hyman Lumer, Tony Monteiro, Richard Morford, Leith Mullings, George B. Murphy, Jr.

Helen and Scott Nearing, Edith and Gibby Needleman, Howard L. Parsons, Florence and Morris Pasternak, Louise F. Patterson, William L. Patterson, Thelma Dale Perkins, Sandy Pollack, Annette Provinzano, Anton Refregier, Beatrice Rippey, Holland Roberts.

Bella Rodman, Pauline Rosen, Frederick L. Schuman, Earl Scott, Helen Scott, Emil Senuk, Phyllis and Matthew Silverman, Norma Spector, Jack D. Spiegel, James Steele, Dirk J. Struik.

Sylvia Hall Thompson, Leon Tolopko, Anthony Toney, Jarvis Tyner, Willard Uphaus, Joe Walker, Mr. and Mrs. Lester Wickstrom, Carl Winter, Helen Allison Winter, Henry Winston, Nathan Witt, Maxine Wood.

#### TENNESSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE, HAROLD FORD, DOING A GOOD JOB IN CONGRESS

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of the 94th Congress, a very well written article appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal newspaper regarding our distinguished colleague from Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District, HAROLD FORD.

Mr. Ford has built a reputation in his district as a hardworking Representative and one who is truly dedicated to good government. As a Member of the freshman class of the 94th Congress, he has maintained a close relationship with his constituency and demonstrated an attitude of determined hard work.

The recognition that this newspaper affords him is well deserved. His dedication and hardworking attitude has won him a position on the Ways and Means Committee and a position of leadership within the freshman class. Moreover, it has won for him a good measure of respect and appreciation among his constituents.

I would like to share the words printed in the Commercial Appeal with our colleagues in the House and insert the story in the RECORD at this point:

(By Morris Cunningham and A. B. Albritton)

Rep. Harold Ford's Washington lifestyle is remarkably austere for a healthy, active, 30-year-old.

An evening meal usually centers around a can of something he opens himself in his apartment, about three blocks from his Washington office where he serves as a Democratic member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Memphis.

After dinner, the freshman representative may read a newspaper or work on something he has brought from the office. Until recently, he didn't have a radio or television in his apartment.

When his wife, Dorothy, is in Washington, Ford fares better and gets bacon and eggs for breakfast. Otherwise, it is juice, cereal and maybe some fruit.

"I eat a big lunch at the Capitol every day. That is my main meal," says Ford.

Until the weather turned cold he rode a bicycle to and from his office. Now he walks the three blocks, though sometimes a staff member will drop him off at night.

Ford prefers bicycles to airplanes, but uses both. "I get a little scared about flying. Sometimes I get on a plane and I just don't feel right. I ask for my ticket back and wait for another flight."

Sometimes he doesn't like the next flight either and takes an even later one.

Despite his fears, Ford flies to and from

Memphis every week when Congress is in session. He hasn't spent a weekend in Washington since he arrived last January.

Ford gets off the airplane at Memphis with a load of dirty clothes to be laundered.

That is only the beginning of a typical weekend at home for the young representative.

Ford heads from the airport to his new home in Whitehaven where he visits his wife and three sons briefly while signing a batch of letters on the kitchen table, and then he's off for a Friday night banquet or some kind of meeting. Ford may even make two meetings on Friday night if the timing is right.

Saturday mornings start in a hurry too. The representative whips by the local cleaners and then he's off to keep a series of appointments at his four Memphis district offices.

On every other Saturday, Ford holds a town hall meeting at a local library or other public place. The average attendance is about 150 people, but he says about 800 or more constituents have turned out a couple of times.

Another Saturday ritual for Ford includes what he calls, "walking my district." He simply goes out on the streets and shakes hands with the voters.

The last Saturday of 1975 was a special day for Ford's never-ending campaign. From his storefront district office on South Lauderdale, the representative hit the streets with his new year's gift to the voters—a calendar with a color picture of the nation's Capitol and the signature of Harold Ford.

A week earlier, Ford had put together 100 food baskets for the needy with the help of local merchants and grocers.

Ford, as a member of Congress, gets 2,000 free calendars every two years. He picked up another 2,000 from a fellow representative who doesn't use them.

So Harold Ford was armed with 4,000 new calendars. They went fast. First, Ford went into a grocery store where he said what he usually does: "I just wanted to come by and say happy new year and give you this calendar." Ford even offered to hang the calendars himself.

On down the streets went Ford, calling most people by their first names as he slapped backs and hands. He forged into liquor stores, barber shops, beauty salons and auto parts stores. "You're a fine young fellow," said Gerald Clifton at the auto parts store.

Earnest Morgan, out for a Saturday stroll, said Ford "is doing a fine job."

Mrs. John Webster, another constituent, says the young representative "is doing great. I don't say he's perfect, but at least he's trying."

Another woman called out as Ford came down the street, "he really gets with the people."

Ford represents about 518,000 Memphis residents who live east of Perkins inside the Interstate 240 loop along with some in Parkway Village, southwest Memphis and part of Whitehaven.

On Saturday nights, Ford tries to make three or four appearances at local meetings where he often speaks.

Sundays are just as busy. Ford usually attends three or four church services during the day and night.

Church is important to Ford as a religious institution and as a political base. "It's really the strong point of my organization," he says.

Sandwiched between all of Ford's weekend activity, there is usually time for some home-cooked meals. Spaghetti and meat balls is one of his favorite meals. Another is neck bones, white beans and turnip greens.

Ford's busy weekends home in Memphis are by design. "You have to love it," says the representative. "If you really love your work it doesn't bother you."

The long days away from Memphis and

the busy days at home "have an effect on your family life. My wife is always on me about it. But I asked for this job and I've got to do it."

Mrs. Ford admits her husband's schedule and long absences "are rough on you. There's just no easy answer."

"But," she says, "I think he's done a beautiful job. I enjoy his work just about as much as he does."

The Ford family has recently moved to a large, two-story home in Whitehaven which cost \$80,000. It's the first house Ford has ever owned and it is lavishly decorated with fine furniture.

The Fords have three sons: Harold Jr., 5, Jake, 3, and Sir Isaac, 1. Younger Isaac is named for singer and entertainer Isaac Hayes of Memphis who is a strong Ford supporter.

Ford's style of representing his constituents is tailored for constant campaigning. He has four district offices in Memphis. The federal government pays the rent for three of those offices and Ford pays for the fourth out of his own pocket.

Ford employs 18 full-time staff members in Memphis and Washington. Their salaries are paid by the federal government.

All his Memphis offices are open during regular business hours. Ford's telephone number is listed in the Memphis directory.

When Ford beat Rep. Dan Kuykendall, a Republican, in 1974 to gain his seat in Congress, he told supporters: "I assure you that you will not have trouble getting in touch with your congressman when you have a problem."

Ford has become more accustomed to the ways of life in Washington as a member of Congress after a year. He says the work is harder and the days longer than the job he held for four years as a member of the Tennessee General Assembly.

Life in Washington, however, is not without its moments of frustration and even embarrassment for a freshman representative.

For instance, take the time nearly a year ago when Ford voted at a Democratic caucus to strip Rep. Wright Patman (D-Texas) of his chairmanship of the House Banking Committee.

After Ford recorded his vote against the veteran committee chairman, he strolled for the first time down to the congressional dining room for lunch. An "older gentleman," according to Ford, "asked me to join him. I thought he was a lobbyist or something."

Ford started the conversation by telling the man how he had just voted against Wright Patman, because "I just thought it was time for us to get a new face."

Ford's luncheon partner then stuck out his hand and said: "My name's Wright Patman."

A freshman representative, according to Washington manners, generally should be seen and not heard in the halls of Congress anyway.

As a first-term representative, Ford generally has filled that bill. And, he has apparently kept his campaign promise to remain available.

While his voice seldom is heard during important debates in the U.S. House of Representatives, Ford has been there most of the time, delivering his vote.

A high absentee rate in the Tennessee legislature, one of the complaints lodged against him in his 1974 campaign, has given way to a different record in Congress.

Of the 590 recorded votes in the House through Dec. 16, Ford voted in 531, a participation record of 90 per cent. And those votes usually were recorded in line with the moderate Mid-South Democratic majority.

His biggest political plus during 1975, however, was gaining assignment to the House Ways and Means Committee, possibly the chamber's most influential committee.

His work there has pleased Rep. Al Ullman (D-Ore.), the committee chairman.

"Harold Ford brings a good mind and a fresh point of view to the committee sessions. He has demonstrated a sense of responsibility and he has cooperated with the chairman very closely."

Ford, says Ullman, also has been diligent in committee session attendance. "He always has been there when we needed him."

"He has done the things a new member should do to get along with the committee."

But since most any form of political clout is denied a freshman, Ford has been using much of his time mending the home fences, trying to protect his seat from challenges. Ford says he has heard of no potential threats so far.

Still, while a freshman is given little authority with which to make himself known, Ford has not been swamped by Washington's waves.

He recently won election as secretary of the Democrats' freshman class, a post from which he will help coordinate the regular Monday briefings for the party's newcomers.

Shelby County Mayor Roy C. Nixon has been impressed with Harold Ford's first-year performance as a member of Congress. "I have found him to be one of the most responsive elected officials for those things our office has contacted him on," says Nixon.

Mayor Wyeth Chandler isn't complaining either about Ford's record so far. He says the freshman representative "has generally backed the programs he has asked us to back and answered the questions we have asked him to answer."

Chandler, who has had at least one political spat with Ford over a mayoral appointee to the local housing authority, rates the Memphis representative as "very cooperative."

Harold Ford has come a long way up the political ladder since he was first elected to the Tennessee General Assembly in 1970. His family has been helpful in his climb to prominence.

His father, Newton J. Ford, 61, owns and operates a funeral home in Memphis. Ford's brother, John, is a member of the City Council and the state Senate. Another brother, Emmitt, is also a member of the state House of Representatives.

Ford got his first taste of politics almost 10 years ago when his father ran for a legislative seat from Memphis. It was a losing battle for the family patriarch, but the start of a successful political career for Harold Ford.

The climb hasn't been all easy, however. In 1972, Ford, who was then a state representative, took a pauper's oath in circuit court contesting more than \$2,000 in judgments against him in back debts.

Ford now earns more than \$44,000 a year in salary as a representative. But even that salary doesn't make him a wealthy man, even with a travel allowance.

Ford's financial plight, the result he says of running for state representative, was "just one of those things."

"We've just about tied it all up now," he says with a smile.

The costs of running an operation like Ford's political machine are high. He comes home every weekend and the government pays for only half of those trips.

"The worst part of my work is traveling back and forth," Ford said. "That's why I can't bring my wife up to Washington every week."

The Memphis representative manages to save a few dollars by buying his \$153.46 airline tickets in advance at a slight discount. And when he makes a weekend speech for a fee somewhere in the South, Ford usually gets a free ride on the airplane to Memphis.



Ford feels like he must keep making the weekly junket from Washington to Memphis, however. "You made a promise at the beginning of the campaign and you have to stick with it."

Although the money Ford earns is seldom enough to buy him a first-class airplane ticket home, he turned down a \$1,000 campaign contribution from a group associated with a local bank in early 1975 even though he owed a campaign debt of about \$6,000.

So the young representative is spending part of his time alone in Washington, part with his family in Memphis, and flying back and forth each week on airplanes he fears.

And how does he like being a member of the U.S. House of Representatives?

"I love it," he said.

"I don't think in terms of re-election," says Ford, but still this year's campaign is on his mind.

Local Republicans would like to recapture the seat in Congress they lost in 1974. GOP State Rep. Brad Martin is considered among those who might entertain the idea of tackling the incumbent under the right set of circumstances.

There also has been speculation that W. Otis Higgs, the former criminal court judge who ran second to Chandler in last year's mayoral election, might consider a race against Ford.

Ford, however, remains confident. He says his campaign network "is a little better organized now. With a year's experience and a good staff, the people will decide."

"I think the people will reward you."

#### GUN OWNERS SHOULD TAKE THE OFFENSIVE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a propaganda war is being waged. The target is the law abiding American who owns a gun. It is an insidious battle. It creeps into panel shows on television. It is observed in cartoon after cartoon on editorial pages of our newspapers. It is written matter of factly into news stories. It crops up in biased polls.

The gun owner should strike back. He, too, must wage a determined battle against those who would encroach on his rights. He must insist that these same people who would take away his firearm turn their attention to the punk and thug who illegally use firearms, not the farmer, small businessman, or factory worker who poses no danger to anyone.

Typical of what I would like to see more of are these responses from two constituents. First, Dick Rench, realtor and gun enthusiast from Norwalk, Ohio, recently fired off this letter to Washington:

DECEMBER 31, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,  
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Just received this date a large poster printed and mailed at Government expense stating "The Theft of Firearms by Criminals Is on the Rise".

How right you are; however, it is not the fault of us gun dealers, but the ridiculous way criminals are released, even after repeated offenses. Every gun shop that I have

been in the past few years has electronic burglar equipment that rivals the largest banks to prevent burglary. The truth is it only keeps the honest persons out.

Criminals steal guns and will continue to do so. This is why the Guns Control Act is not working. I suggest that you send a large red poster of the type I received to all judges in the United States advising them that "Soft Judges Make Hard Criminals."

Please direct your work against the criminal and not give us gun dealers more paperwork.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. RENCH,  
President.

Mr. Speaker, this letter hits the issue right on the head. More of this should be done by the thousands of gun owners who are being assaulted daily in the press and by the liberal special interest groups and organizations. Congratulations to Dick Rench.

In the Mansfield, Ohio, News-Journal, I have noted an increasing number of letters to the editor both pro and con on the antigun issue. Let us get that straight right off the bat. The antigun people would like to label their battle as one of gun control. It is not gun control, it is an antigun drive. It may take the form of a restriction here, a requirement there or a proposal for bureaucratic study but it all adds up to the same target and that is a nationwide drive against firearms.

This letter by David H. Schuck typifies the type of letters we should be writing to newspapers everywhere in the country.

[From the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal,  
Dec. 8, 1975]

I have just finished reading Rod Blahnik's letter on "tough federal gun laws." In it, Mr. Blahnik writes about "the big money gun lobbyists" and implies that the people swaying our legislators against gun control are not legitimate voting citizens. I believe that, like many people today (including Rep. Conyers), Mr. Blahnik has lost his grip on reality. If you want to see which side of the issue the big money is on, check out the assets of Sen. Ted Kennedy as well as the membership rosters of anti-gun organizations such as Fund for Animals and Friends of Animals.

Living in today's society, we have been told time and again that, when confronted by a mugger or rapist or burglar, we should do whatever he asks, give him all he asks for, and then, hopefully, he'll let us go unharmed. After all, we are told, no possession is worth risking life and limb. Well, I'd say that it is a pretty sad state of affairs when people won't defend what is rightfully theirs. It is even sadder when they can't. Gun control would not take weapons out of the hands of criminals; it would simply deprive the honest citizen of an equal chance against the armed criminal, and rob him of the right to defend himself, his family, and his home.

What this country needs is not more "tough federal gun laws," but tougher judges, fewer legal loopholes, and bigger prisons. Too many people today are concerned about the poor, socially-deprived criminal. It's about time we started worrying more about his victims and how they may defend themselves against him. The police can do nothing until the crime has already been committed.

DAVID H. SCHUCK.

Mr. President, the nationwide drive against firearms is a part of the overall propaganda battle which has been waged during the past decade. The liberals would turn everything upside down. The FBI, CIA and the police are the problem

in society. The muggers and rapists are the victims of not only the police but also society and the antiwar activists and radicals who brandish machine guns and use dynamite are the visionaries of our time. The draft dodgers in Canada and Sweden are the true Americans, those who went to Vietnam were misguided at worst and stupid at best. All authority is bad and therefore the children should tell their parents, not vice versa, the prisoners should dictate terms to the jailers, the students tell the teachers and the welfare classes tell the productive worker what he must give them. Laugh if you will but it is deadly serious. Conservatives are bad guys, the liberals alone care. The United States is the threat to the world, the Communists and the beggar nations called the third world will straighten things out. And yes, the average law-abiding gun owner is the threat, the criminal is not. Do not think this is Alice in Wonderland. This is the propaganda battle in which you are engaged today and the stakes are very high. Get into the fight, Mister Gun Owner and use the legal means you have to defend your rights.

#### U.S. MUST MOVE FORWARD ON ILLICIT DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8 included a detailed statement by the distinguished Senate Majority Leader Mike MANSFIELD which was quite critical of our country's international drug enforcement efforts. The Senator uses an article entitled "The Drug Enforcement Agency Abroad" which appeared in the November Foreign Service Journal as a basis for much of this criticism. His analysis of our drug policy together with certain erroneous assumptions must, I feel, be brought to the attention of this body lest we revert to totally unsatisfactory measures for dealing with this most crucial matter.

The Senator finds fault with our international cooperative drug enforcement efforts and cites instances where U.S. officials displace local law enforcement agents in apprehending drug traffickers. Such action, he claims, creates a cloud of ambivalence with respect to our foreign policy and he alludes to the Journal article which cites "DEA catching criminals—including American criminals—while U.S. consulates try to protect U.S. citizens' rights to the fullest." To conclude on this basis, as the Senator does, that this country bears the responsibility for the mistreatment of its own citizens jailed on narcotics charges is without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, as an active advocate of penal reform in our own country, I would be the last to condone reported acts of brutality inflicted upon our citizens incarcerated in other countries; to this ex-

tent, I strongly support investigations which have been undertaken by several of my colleagues on the issue and am as concerned as they are for a prompt redress. At the same time, however, we must insist on the apprehension of those who are feeding this deadly poison to our Nation's youth regardless of what side of the border they come from. The fact that leaders of many nations can come together and effect such control efforts should be a recognized achievement and not negated.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator's statement could not come at a more inopportune time. The Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Operations will soon be considering the funding level for our contribution to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control—The Fund—and it is imperative that we at least continue our contribution at the present funding level. Through The Fund we have been most effective in impacting on those campaigns designed to interdict and eradicate illicit narcotics throughout the world. Crop replacement, air and ground surveillance to guard against unauthorized poppy planting, and the U.N. Central Training Unit are examples of activities that The Fund has provided.

In connection with the training function, it is important to note that both Customs and drug enforcement officials have been invited to participate and have, according to the United Nations, contributed an invaluable service to the program. Our international cooperative efforts simply cannot be minimized. High level reports and my own direct involvement with leaders of other nations suggest that we must intensify our efforts in educating others in the international arena on ways by which we can, together, effectively control this deadly menace.

Our contribution to the fund is minimal in comparison with the tremendous cost to this country's community-at-large both in taxpayers' dollars—now estimated to be \$12 billion and upward—and the untold number of broken homes and other forms of human suffering that the problem of drug abuse causes. To further illustrate my point, I need only to bring to my colleagues' attention a summation of a social cost study which was prepared several years ago by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. The study reported the following:

**SOCIAL COST STUDY  
HEALTH COSTS**

Under this category, the number of primarily drug-related emergency room visits, and inpatient general care and mental hospital days devoted to the treatment of drug disorders accounted for almost \$200 million.

**PRODUCTIVITY LOSSES**

For those drug abusers who are employed or looking for work, productivity losses of approximately \$1.5 billion can be assumed based on the number of drug-related deaths and consequent foregone earnings; number drug-related inpatient hospital days resulting in foregone productivity costs; and estimated number of unemployed individuals whose unemployment is associated with drug use.

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM COSTS**

The proportion of state and local police salaries, estimated share of state and local legal, court and corrections costs and federal correction costs devoted to drug-related crime and offenders totals \$620 million.

**PROPERTY LOSS**

The drug-related social cost of income-producing crime committed to support heroin habits is estimated at \$6.3 billion. This figure is derived by multiplying the number of addicts times the days per year of heroin use times the average cost per day of habit times a fencing factor for stolen goods.

**DIRECT PROGRAM COSTS**

Government and private efforts devoted to drug abuse education, treatment, rehabilitation and drug traffic prevention cost an estimated \$1.1 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, given the foregoing, I find it difficult to conceive how we can provide the necessary resources and wherewithal to join hands with an adversary in order to explore the unknown and at the same time listen to suggestions that we turn inward in our battle against drug abuse. To breach a number of agreements that we have made over time, which require that we join with the international community in resolving this problem, would be an affront to our neighbors around the world and a disservice to the American people.

**THE URGENT NEED FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION**

**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the House's attention to the excellent editorial appearing in today's New York Times. This editorial describes the crisis situation confronting the Nation in terms of the eminent exhaustion of unemployment benefits of 2.5 million workers during the first quarter of 1976. The Times then goes on to point out the urgent need for full employment legislation introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and myself, together with Representative REUSS, and cosponsored by over a hundred other Senators and Congressmen, H.R. 50 and S. 50, which draft legislation should be ready in revised form within 1 or 2 weeks from this date.

The editorial follows:

**UNINSURED JOBLESS**

The State of New Jersey's intention to borrow \$300 million from the Federal Government this year to keep its overstrained unemployment insurance fund from going broke is dramatic evidence of the crushing burden joblessness is putting on employers, who pay the taxes to support the Federal-state job benefit system.

New Jersey, with an unemployment rate far above the intolerably high national level, already owes Washington \$400 million in funds it borrowed to defray past shortages. It is one of 16 states which, along with the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, are currently in debt to the Federal Government because direct payroll taxes from their recession-hit industries are insufficient to meet the benefit load. The total borrowing by these states now exceeds \$2 billion. Unless Congress approves higher employer taxes recommended by the Administration, the combined deficit in Federal and state trust funds is expected to pass \$22 billion by 1978.

Even more distressing in human terms is the rapid rise in the number of idle workers who are exhausting all the payments to which they are entitled without yet being able to find new jobs. The normal six-month maximum for benefit payments has been extended to 15 months through a series of Federally-financed emergency programs authorized by Congress and approved by President Ford.

Yet, even with these liberalizations, the Labor Department estimates that upward of 2.5 million workers will use up all the benefits for which they are legally eligible in the first quarter of 1976. Neither the White House nor Congress plans any further extensions—in part, because constantly extended benefits paid out of general revenues would negate the insurance principle and convert the system into a variant of public welfare. The hardships which mass exhaustion of benefits will inflict on workers and their families, plus the spreading crisis in state insurance reserves, make it clear that the nation must accord much higher priority to full employment than does the President in his State of the Union and economic messages. Up to now the Democrats in control on Capitol Hill have been almost as derelict as the White House in this field, confining themselves to pie-in-the-sky programs with no real chance of passage.

However, Senator Humphrey says that the somewhat visionary Full Employment Bill which he co-sponsored in the last Congress is being rewritten along more realistic lines. To the extent that the revised measure offers genuine hope for putting the unemployed back to work without reigniting the inflationary fires, it will represent an invaluable contribution toward meeting the country's most pressing domestic need.

**HOLY NAME HOSPITAL**

**HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, Holy Name Hospital of Teaneck, N.J., recently marked its first 50 years of dedicated service.

The Holy Name Hospital School of Nursing is the largest hospital school in New Jersey, and the devotion and humanitarian approach of the nurses and doctors, under the direction of Sister Evelyn, indicates the service that all those who have needed help have received from Holy Name Hospital.

The regional hemodialysis center, the institute of prenatal studies, the self-care unit, and the poison control center meet and respond to the needs of the community in an extraordinary manner.

Teaneck's Holy Name Hospital and all its centers of study, research and services are geared toward improving the quality of life of all people.

The Holy Name Hospital will continue to serve, in the years ahead, in its traditions of care and caring.



## NEW WORK FOR PUBLIC WORKS

## HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently noted with great interest an article in the Corps of Engineers' Water Spectrum magazine by our esteemed colleague, Bob Jones of Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, who has long been nationally recognized as an expert and leader in the programs under the jurisdiction of his committee.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a copy of the article contained in the Water Spectrum, and I recommend it to all Members:

## NEW WORK FOR PUBLIC WORKS

The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation exercises legislative authority over a broad sweep of national activities that profoundly influence the development of America and the lives of her people.

In the early life of the Nation, public works were linked directly and almost exclusively to the needs of commerce—roads, inland waterways, coastal harbors, and navigational aids. This initial emphasis soon broadened into new and more sophisticated forms of public works necessitated by the Nation's westward expansion and its growing interest in the markets of Europe and the Far East. Railroads received Federal land grants and the eastern rivers and harbors were overhauled to facilitate a growing maritime commerce. With the 1900's came realization that the arid lands of the West must be made fertile and the rivers harnessed. A new era of public works began and Congress turned its attention to irrigation and dams and flood control projects.

Until 1946, House involvement in the areas of public works came under the jurisdiction of four separate committees—Rivers and Harbors (established in 1883), Roads (1913), Flood Control (1916), and Public Buildings (1837). In 1946, the functions of the four committees were consolidated into subcommittees of a new Committee with the broader title of Public Works.

In recent decades there have been various alterations in the structure of that Committee, with the most significant being this year's reorganization. The former Public Works Committee was expanded to include two new areas—civil aviation and all surface transportation modes except railroads. Now, with six subcommittees on Water Resources, Surface Transportation, Public Buildings and Grounds, Economic Development, Investigations and Review, and Aviation, our all-important challenge is to make the optimum use of both public works and transportation investments. Our Public Works and Transportation Committee wants to use careful planning to give the future a more rational shape.

## THE COMMITTEE AND WATER RESOURCES

Our efforts in this Congress are directed toward three major areas: employment, economic development, and planning for the future. In writing this article, I want to discuss the significance of public works and transportation policy as related to these three areas and the pivotal relationship of water to all our activities.

The Committee plans to work toward the most efficient and beneficial use of the Nation's water resources. This focus includes a reexamination of the means by which water resources projects are formulated and evaluated; consideration of adequate water supplies, deepwater port programs, and im-

provement of our inland waterway system; and an investigation of the Federal Government's role in waterborne transportation. I will comment on each of these Committee considerations.

Some modifications of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-500) are being considered in this session, but a decision on the majority of proposals is being deferred until the National Commission on Water Quality submits its report on the economic, social, and environmental effects of achieving the effluent limitations required by 1983. Additional legislation on water resources development may be required this year—depending on the submission of Corps of Engineers project reports. Also, under the authority of Section 80 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, the Water Resources Council is studying the principles and standards used in formulating and evaluating water resources projects and the means of dividing Federal and non-Federal cost sharing for such projects. Its recommendations of major importance to the future of water resources development, are expected later this year.

More specifically, the Committee wants to consider multiple methods for flood control and water pollution abatement. For example, we should be able to more efficiently plan that Nation's highway construction so that roadfill can also function as a levee or be used protectively to block and concentrate polluted sediment until it can be treated. At 42,000 miles and a projected cost of \$76 billion, the Interstate Highway System is the biggest public works project ever undertaken. The role of a project of this magnitude cannot be overestimated in terms of its effect on the Nation's growth patterns. We should be able to locate and extend these highways so that they function as an integral part of our total investment planning. Highways and waterways, as the physical links between communities, can be used to influence community planning and thus alter population growth and economic development.

Airports can be planned to complement the characteristics of the surrounding land and water. Airports are often located on flood plains and even more frequently are sited next to rivers or harbors. Planners should more carefully consider the effect of the airport on the surrounding flood plain—it is likely that a facility of this size would increase the elevation and velocity of flood waters and thus magnify flood damage.

The Committee also wants to consider the design and construction of deepwater ports under the provisions of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974. The purposes of this act are to regulate commerce, promote efficiency in transportation, and protect the environment by establishing procedures for the location, construction, and operation of deepwater ports.

Improvements in the navigability of the Nation's harbors and streams also merit our consideration. This is particularly important now because of current economic and energy conditions and because about 60 percent of the freight moved on inland and intracoastal waterways is coal and petroleum products. The growth and expansion of water-based industries has traditionally been linked to the successful operation and maintenance of waterways and harbor facilities. Such industries provide an abundance of low cost basic materials for consumer goods industries and indirectly generate additional jobs and higher incomes. Industrial expansion also raises the taxation base of a community, which in turn helps provide local schools, hospitals, roads, and other community services. Modern highways permit workers residing in localities remote from a river to commute daily to jobs in these water-related industries. Thus, the mutual benefits shared

by public works and transportation are many.

A long-range goal of our expanded Committee is to submit an overall plan of improvement for the inland navigation system that will maximize its net contribution to the Nation's total transportation system. It is important to maintain the dimensions and operating conditions of waterways so that they are safe and economical for waterborne commerce, but we do not want a disproportionate investment of time and effort on any particular navigation feature.

## AN EMPLOYMENT PLAN

The Committee's long-range focus is economic development through "investment planning." By way of further explanation, we want to implement programs that will develop depressed areas and increase employment. And we can use public works and transportation policies to do so.

Among the pieces of legislation intended to stimulate employment is the Emergency Local Public Works and Capital Development Investment Act of 1975. It authorizes up to \$5 billion for direct, 100 percent grants-in-aid to State and local governments for construction, repair, or other improvement of local public works facilities—projects of the type which can be initiated promptly and which will have an immediate impact on local unemployment. Stipulations are that each project must stimulate employment and be started within 90 days after grant approval. An additional feature is that the project will be automatically approved if a decision is not made on the application within 60 days after receipt. I consider passage of this type of legislation to be a clear signal that Congress is determined to break the rising spiral of unemployment.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

As long ago as 1935, the National Resources Committee wrote that regional planning should "confine itself to dealing with the physical resources and equipment out of which socio-economic progress arises." At the time, the Federal Government's only point of entry into regional planning was through water resources. If water resources were developed for a multiplicity of uses within a watershed, it was hoped that social and economic advances would spin-off from that development. Thus, the physical setting for regional planning was always a major drainage basin organized for comprehensive resource development.

The overall strategy in developing the existing regional planning commissions was threefold: to alter supply characteristics by investment in the public infrastructure; to encourage new private investment and thereby induce self-generating growth; and to prevent re-emergence of depressed area problems by establishing Federal-multistate institutions with powers to initiate and coordinate regional plans and guide regional economic growth. The consensus developed that long-term economic planning for lagging regions was relatively ineffective if individual States operated economically only within their own boundaries and if Federal-State cooperation was molded by narrowly conceived bilateral deals between individual agencies and States. Multiple agency Federal involvement was seen as the genuine answer to the social and economic problems generated by unemployment and persistently low incomes within a multistate region.

Thus, an entirely new dimension in U.S. regional planning began in 1965 with the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which authorized the Coastal Plains, Four Corners, New England, Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, Old West, and Pacific Northwest Regional Commissions, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has jurisdiction over all of West Virginia and parts of 12 States extending along the Ap-

palachian ridge from New York to the northern tiers of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi. In this Congress, Federal support of economic development programs in the 13-State Appalachian region is being continued through a renewal bill that authorizes \$300 million for the highway program and \$340 million for non-highway programs, such as pollution control, timber development, and special projects in the areas of health, education, and housing.

#### PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

All of the current legislation—on water resources, employment, and economic development—stresses a Committee emphasis on planning. Here is where a public works and transportation investment policy becomes crucial. Too often in the past similar projects have been used merely to "catch up" on the problems created by unplanned urban expansion, rather than as a force to shape more orderly growth of communities. However, there are steps we can take to make our declining rural areas and our decaying central cities—which share the problems of unemployment and a depressed economy—more attractive places to settle.

For example, we can make it more attractive to build high-density housing in the inner city to accommodate the smaller families and single individuals we expect would want to congregate there if suitable facilities were available. Also, better transportation links to rural areas can bring them within the orbit of the cities. And, we can switch planning for mass transportation systems from demonstration- to service-oriented programs. As an example of this program transition, the personal rapid transit system developed at West Virginia University's Morgantown campus can be converted into a viable transportation alternative for that city. The personal rapid transit system, generally referred to as PRT, is a sort of hybrid monorail and minibus, using fixed railways to guide small, driverless, computer-controlled cars. With a capacity of only 3,300 riders per hour, PRT is not to be regarded as a substitute for the faster, high-capacity rail systems, but it can be a convenient way of moving persons around downtown areas, airports, and campuses.

In formation of a public works and transportation policy, there are certain problem areas. For example, the Federal Government must come to terms with the inequality of public spending as it relates to different modes of transportation. This investment imbalance reflects a lack of comprehensive planning and policy oversight at different levels of government. It is all too obvious that we need to work on establishment of a consistent national policy on Federal sources of investment funds for transportation.

The related question of transportation subsidies is also complex and controversial—one that will not be quickly resolved. But the Committee wants to look at the problem and consider the various methods of equalizing Federal investments. One proposal is to tax all fuel used for commercial shallow-draft shipping and recreational boating on navigable waterways constructed and maintained at Federal expense. This proposal, along with others, will be reviewed by the Committee in its study of Federal and non-Federal cost sharing for water resources development.

Clearly, all transportation modes—air, land, and water—have a role to play in the total national requirement to move commodities and people, and each mode has unique advantages given a particular transportation objective. Frequently overlooked in the competition among models is the fact that waterborne commerce must continue to play an ever-increasing role. Multimodal transportation planning should not be considered just in relation to urban development—the role of waterways in population redistribu-

tion must also be emphasized. Similar to highways, the waterways have opened formerly isolated areas to initial commercial development. This ongoing industrial expansion is vital to maintaining economic growth. Thus, the quality of the Nation's overall water management program is critical to maintaining a viable economy and the improving quality of life.

#### U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

(Chm-Robert E. Jones-Ala.)

##### Water Resources

(Chm-Ray Roberts-Tex.)

##### Economic Development

(Chm-Robert A. Roe-N.J.)

##### Surface Transportation

(Chm-James J. Howard-N.J.)

##### Investigations and Review

(Chm-Jim Wright-Tex.)

##### Public Buildings and Grounds

(Chm-Teno Roncalio-Wyo.)

##### Aviation

(Chm-Glen M. Anderson-Calif.)

Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

Measures relating to Capital Building and Senate and House Office Buildings.

Measures relating to construction and maintenance of roads.

Measures relating to construction and maintenance of buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institute.

Measures relating to construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

Public buildings and improved grounds of the United States.

Public works for the benefit of navigation.

Water power.

Transportation, including civil aviation, except railroads, railroad labor, and pensions.

Roads and their safety.

Water transportation subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Related transportation regulatory agencies, except the Interstate Commerce Commission as it relates to railroads, the Federal Railroad Administration, and Amtrak.

Structure and functions of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

#### RETAIL CLERKS OPPOSE GAS DEREGULATION

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, soon this House will take up the momentous question of whether or not to permit deregulation of the price of natural gas.

I am a strong believer in free market economics, but I recognize—as Adam Smith did—that this theory cannot function unless there is in actuality a free, competitive market. And the lamentable fact is that there is no free market in energy resources today.

Every Member of this House knows that deregulated natural gas would skyrocket in price—and every one of us knows that this will not be due to "free market" forces, but to the concentrated

market power of the OPEC nations and the energy conglomerates.

A vivid letter I received from James T. Housewright, international president of the Retail Clerks International Association, describes the devastating impact of such a violent economic disruption. Mr. Housewright points out the human costs—at least 1 percent of additional inflation; several hundred thousand jobs wiped out; and an added \$400 cost to the average American family—this year alone. And he points out where the money would go—as much as \$14.6 billion to the gas companies in 1976.

The gas producers are not going bankrupt. Current price levels guarantee them an equitable rate of return on their investment. But to an administration dedicated to the principle that "the business of America is Big Business," a fair return on investment apparently is not enough.

I urge my colleagues to read this informative letter. Mr. Housewright speaks, not just for the 660,000 American members of his union, but for the 215 million Americans who would be penalized by the deregulation of natural gas prices. Our choice is not between a "fixed" price and a "free market" price. It is between an extortionate price fixed by the energy conglomerates and a fair price set by the American people, acting through their elected government. It is the duty of this House to side with the people.

Mr. Housewright's letter follows:

RETAIL CLERKS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION,

January 14, 1976.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: When the Second Session of the 94th Congress convenes, you will be faced with a decision on whether or not the price of natural gas, now regulated by the Federal Power Commission, should be deregulated.

You have been told by the Administration and some powerful lobbyists that deregulation will be good for the economy, that jobs will be saved and that producers will have an incentive to produce gas. For the reasons that follow, the Retail Clerks International Union, which represents over 700,000 workers, strongly disagrees with this view and urges you to oppose any efforts to deregulate the price of natural gas, either temporarily or permanently.

According to a December 31 Library of Congress study, deregulation will cost consumers between \$12.7 and \$14.6 billion by the end of 1976 for no extra supply at all. According to the report, "This implies that an additional 8/10ths to 9/10ths of a percentage point will be added to the inflation rate, creating some form of energy shock. Ripple effects could enlarge this by at least 50 percent, causing the 1976 inflationary impact to be 1.2 to 1.4 percentage points. Employment would be several hundred thousand jobs lower than it would have been without this economic shock." In simpler terms, we have computed that an average family would be paying an additional \$400 a year in higher prices due to deregulation as passed by the Senate. Frankly, our members and their families simply cannot afford this increase. Nor can our economy afford the increase.

It is unlikely that deregulation will provide producers with any additional incentive to end the shortage. It must be understood that the market for the natural gas producer is not competitive and that, therefore, prices will be set by monopoly power. The producers—that is, the major oil com-



panies—that control most of the gas reserves in this country will continue to constrain supply in order to keep prices up.

The only way to protect consumers and provide producers with a fair rate of return is for the Federal Power Commission to continue to regulate prices in a just and reasonable manner. In addition, we would urge that you support efforts to extend regulation to the unregulated intrastate market, which so dramatically affects interstate commerce, so that all consumers and all producers can be treated equally.

We urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to oppose deregulation of any form.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. HOUSEWRIGHT,  
International President.

## THE CASE THAT PUT JIM CROW OFF THE BUS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago last December 1, the civil rights movement was launched. Mrs. Rosa Parks had boarded a bus in downtown Montgomery and taken a seat in the so-called no man's land, an area in the center of the bus which both whites and blacks could occupy, but which blacks had to relinquish to whites who had no other seats. A white man asked for the seat and Mrs. Parks refused. "I felt I was being treated wrong," she explained years afterward, "and I didn't have any other means of letting it be known that I objected to being treated as I was." She refused to move when the bus driver ordered her to. A few days later, stirred by the quiet courage of Rosa Parks, Edgar Nixon, leader of the Montgomery NAACP chapter, succeeded in organizing a bus boycott and obtaining the assistance of a young Baptist minister, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The segregation of buses in Montgomery ended within a year. And the resolve and organized will of black people there reverberated throughout the Nation. Rosa Parks is today a symbol of supreme courage. When asked why she acted as she did, Mrs. Parks responds simply by saying, she did what she thought was right. But the fact of the matter is, her action is a testament to the power of the single individual who takes a determined stand against injustice.

Nicholas C. Chriss eloquently recounts in the December 1, 1975, issue of the Los Angeles Times the story of that event as it happened then and as it is remembered by its participants today. Most were transformed by it, as was the Nation. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

THE CASE THAT PUT JIM CROW OFF THE BUS  
(By Nicholas C. Chriss)

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—It was 5 a.m. on a December day in 1955—cold, damp and dark—when one of the city's segregated buses rolled up to downtown's Court Square for a load of passengers—whites up front, blacks in the back.

The bus driver was edgy. There had been stories of a massive bus boycott, perhaps violence, to begin that morning by Montgomery's 50,000 black citizens. There was a crude, freshly painted sign on the square proclaimed: "People, don't ride the bus today. Don't ride it for freedom."

Across the street, with only three weeks until Christmas, a banner was stretched across the front of a department store, the Montgomery Fair. It read, Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward Men.

The bus stopped. The driver saw a lone Negro on the square, paint on his shoe and jacket. The driver opened the door cautiously. Are you gittin' on the bus?" he asked.

"I ain't gittin' on, till Jim Crow gets off," the black man replied. The driver closed the door and drove away.

The Montgomery bus boycott had begun. The historic moment that had set it in motion had come four days before, on Thursday, Dec. 1—20 years ago today—when Mrs. Rosa Parks, a black, refused to give her seat to a white man on the driver's orders. Mrs. Parks, who was subsequently arrested, was the secretary of the local chapter of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People and she had just finished a long day's work as a seamstress at the Montgomery, Ala. Fair.

Rosa Parks' arrest was a landmark in the movement to end Jim Crow—the tradition of segregation—in this country. It sparked what has been called the black revolution.

The fuse lighted by Mrs. Parks' arrest sputtered across the country in the years that followed, occasionally causing explosions of violence.

From it emerged the Montgomery bus boycott, which eventually broke the back of some of the city's harshest segregation laws, brought the bus company into bankruptcy and gave tangible signs of hope to blacks throughout the Deep South.

One year after the boycott began, on Dec. 13, 1956, the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated Montgomery's bus segregation laws.

The bus boycott gave birth to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Congress of Racial Equality. It altered the work of the NAACP and the National Urban League, and gave rise to marches, riots, beatings, assassinations and legislation—all part of the struggle over something that was becoming known as the civil rights movement.

There had been another bus boycott, in Baton Rouge, La., a year earlier. And there had been other racial injustices, beatings, arrests, murders. But, for reasons no one has ever been able to explain fully, it took Mrs. Parks' arrest to mobilize the forces that had been bubbling beneath the surface for years.

Today, Mrs. Parks, known as the mother of the civil rights movement, is a secretary in the Detroit office of Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.). She remains, her friends say, a humble and shy woman with a vast reservoir of courage.

Mrs. Parks had boarded the bus that day in 1955 around 6 p.m. at Court Square, after a long day of raising and lowering hemlines at Montgomery Fair. She had seated herself in a sort of "no man's land" in the center of the bus—a section that both whites and blacks used on a first-come-first-served basis.

In those days the bus driver had police powers bestowed on him by the city's bus segregation code. The driver that day was J. F. Blake, now retired at 62, after 32 years with the bus line.

"The very first mention he made of us vacating the seats, didn't any of us move," Mrs. Parks recalled recently in an interview.

She and three other blacks were in the no-man's-land of seats which, as the bus filled, they were expected to vacate in favor of whites.

A white man was standing near by, waiting for a seat.

He knew what was coming. He told the Negroes, "Y'all better make it light on yourselves and let me have those seats," Mrs. Parks recalled.

Jim Crowism had been around for a long time in Montgomery. No one suspected that Mrs. Parks would not move. The other blacks did. But she refused.

"I felt I was being treated wrong," she said. "I didn't have any other means of letting it be known that I objected to being treated as I was, and that's why I didn't move."

She was arrested by officers F. B. Day and D. W. Nixon, after Blake called the police. The officers asked the driver if he wanted to swear out a warrant for her arrest, or simply let her go after they took her off the bus. Blake chose the warrant.

Looking back on those moments, Blake said in an interview recently that he had no other choice because the bus line had ordered the drivers to carry out the city code.

Segregated bus seating, he said, "was a pain all the way you went."

"I couldn't see it a lot of times," he said, especially for crowded runs in black sections where the seats reserved for whites in the front of the bus remained vacant.

Mrs. Parks was booked at the city jail the day of her arrest and at least 50 persons, including a few whites, showed up to offer to sign her \$100 bond. It eventually was signed by Edgar Daniel Nixon, head of the local NAACP and a fighter for black civil rights since the 1930s.

Nixon, now 76, is the man who, on the day after Mrs. Parks' arrest, first proposed the bus boycott. Today, he is an adviser to several housing projects in Montgomery.

Most of those who took part in the episode 20 years ago are still in Montgomery, including Blake, the police officers, the desk sergeant who booked Mrs. Parks and others.

It was Edgar Nixon who was responsible for bringing together the people who gave impetus to the boycott. They met at the Dexter Ave. Baptist Church two days after Mrs. Parks' arrest. The pastor was a 25-year-old minister named Martin Luther King, a man with a divinity degree from Boston University, steeped in the philosophy of Thoreau, Hegel, Kant and Gandhi.

King had gained some repute in Montgomery for his speaking abilities and Edgar Nixon chose him to lead the boycott in the Montgomery Improvement Assn. Nixon, a longtime churchgoer, knew a good speaker when he heard one, and he had heard King in August.

"I turned to a friend," he recalled recently, "and, after we heard Rev. King speak, I said, 'Some day I'm gonna hang him to the stars.'"

"We needed a leader who could speak. I suggested that we organize the bus boycott. I selected Rev. King as a spokesman. A lot of people think he started the boycott; people all over the world think that. But it was me. Course, I don't pay no mind. As long as the job got done. That's what was important!"

A new generation has grown up since the day Edgar Nixon signed Mrs. Parks' bond, and its members may have difficulty recalling the temper of the times.

But during the week of the arrest and the start of the boycott—just those few days—the mutilated body of an NAACP leader was found near Schulenberg, Tex., and the Ku Klux Klan gave another NAACP leader in Ellmore, S.C., one day to leave town.

Also that week, 37 black garbage men failed to show up for work one rainy day in Montgomery. They were being paid \$6.60 a day.

And in neighboring Georgia, Gov. Marvin Griffin kicked up a segregation storm because Georgia Tech was scheduled to play Pittsburgh in the Sugar Bowl. The Pitts-

burgh team had a black second-string tail-back. If the game took place, Griffin warned, "The relentless seas will rush in and destroy us. The South stands at Armageddon."

A. B. Champion, a white citizen in Montgomery, became so incensed by the black boycott that he wrote a letter to the Montgomery Advertiser, the local newspaper: "I can tell you what Alabama needs. It needs an 1860 model Ku Klux Klan, and I would like to be the one to call the signals." The Klan reportedly had its beginning in 1860.

Champion is 82 years old now, and has suffered two heart attacks. His wife said he was sunning himself in the back yard and probably should not be questioned about the boycott. But, she added, "We are real Southerners."

G. J. Ruppenthal, Montgomery police chief in 1955, had little to say during the boycott and less to say today. He refused to be interviewed.

Ruppenthal was the city's first Roman Catholic police chief and therefore was under some suspicion in this largely Protestant area. He once ordered one of the city's two black policemen to accompany Edgar Nixon home with \$700 collected at a mass boycott rally. There were rumors that Ruppenthal had sympathy for the blacks. Today he is a Circuit Court bailiff in Montgomery.

The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who worked side by side with Edgar Nixon and King, and was King's companion during the civil rights movement, today is leading a march in Mississippi on behalf of a black youth sentenced to death in the slaying of a white woman.

W. A. (Packy) Gayle, mayor of Montgomery in 1955, has been dead about 10 years. Clifford J. Durr, one of the whites who offered to sign Mrs. Parks' bond, died a year ago. K. H. Bagley, the bus company manager, also is dead.

One of the more interesting figures in the boycott episode was Juliette Morgan, a white librarian who gained brief national fame for a poignant letter she wrote to the Montgomery newspaper in which she sympathized with the black bus boycott:

"It is hard to imagine a soul so dead, a heart so hard, a vision so blinded and provincial as not to be moved with admiration, at the quiet dignity, discipline and dedication with which the Negroes have conducted their boycott."

Miss Morgan committed suicide about a year later. According to some reports, she did so because of harassment from whites.

Mrs. Jo Ann Robinson was the woman who wrote the first pamphlets about the boycott that flooded the black areas. She now lives in Los Angeles.

The pamphlets showed up in the Negro sections on Saturday but it is unlikely the proposed boycott would have received major publicity had not a story about it appeared on the front page of the Sunday Montgomery Advertiser.

NAACP leader Edgar Nixon had tipped off Joe Azbell, the Advertiser's city editor, about the boycott. The four-paragraph story of Mrs. Parks' arrest Thursday had appeared on Page 9 of Friday's paper. But as more information became available about the likelihood of a massive boycott, the story became more important.

Azbell's front page story Sunday outlined plans for the boycott and the details of the planning.

The next day, Monday, Azbell attended a mass meeting of 5,000 blacks at the Holt St. Baptist Church. He then wrote a column that surprised many whites because it praised the Negroes for their discipline and described the warmth and feeling at the meeting. Many whites had thought the meeting might erupt into violence throughout the city.

Azbell today is Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace's chief publicist, as he has been for

years. It was he who coined the Wallace slogans "Send 'em a Message" and "Trust the People."

"It was an unusual period for me," Azbell recalled recently. He called the entire episode of Mrs. Parks' arrest and the bus boycott, including the eventual bankruptcy of the bus line and the eventual overthrow of the Jim Crow laws, a "\$14 disaster" that could have been avoided with some understanding, or even some pragmatism, on the part of white leaders.

Mrs. Parks' fine and court costs for refusing to leave her bus seat amounted to \$14.

Azbell was and still is a friend of Nixon, the NAACP leader who first had the idea of the bus boycott.

"And here I sit today writing speeches for George Wallace," Azbell remarked.

Another ironic twist may be the occasional meetings these days between Edgar Nixon and Clyde Sellers, the hard-line segregationist police commissioner at the time of Rosa Parks' arrest and the bus boycott. Sellers was one of the black community's toughest antagonists in those days.

They are probably the only two persons from the episode who still see each other regularly. Both are members of a senior citizens aid committee.

Nixon said he was introduced at a meeting of their senior citizens group, whereupon Sellers said, "I know that gentleman. We were on different sides of the fence then."

Nixon said he told Sellers, "Yes, and I'm not sure you still aren't on the same side."

In an interview, Sellers said, "I was a segregationist, and I'm still a segregationist, but I believe every man has his rights. The boycott's over and done with and dead and gone. It was a lost weekend. The only thing I hate is that Martin Luther King had to end up the way he did."

#### USE OF TERGITOL ON ROOSTS OF BLACKBIRDS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the House passed, by unanimous consent, H.R. 11510, an emergency bill allowing the States of Tennessee and Kentucky an exemption from certain provisions of the National Environmental Pesticide Control Act.

That bill will allow both States to spray the chemical Tergitol on roosts of blackbirds in areas that are certified as emergency areas by the Governors of both States and the Secretary of the Interior. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the bipartisan effort on the part of both the Tennessee and Kentucky delegations that made the passage of this bill possible.

Speaking for my own Seventh District of Tennessee, this legislation is extremely important to the people of west Tennessee. They have been attempting to combat this growing nuisance for a number of years without much success due to the interest in the eradication of the birds from several out of State animal protection organizations.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with this body the problems that these flocks of birds have posed for my area.

They have inflicted an enormous amount of economic damage on my district and the districts surrounding mine, represented by my colleagues, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BEARD, and Mr. HUBBARD. Tennessee Commissioner of Agriculture Ed Porter, reports farm losses of \$1 million per day due to the presence of the birds.

More importantly, they have posed an even more dangerous health hazard to the people who live in these areas. In Milan, Tenn., there is a roost of these birds that contains an estimated 8.5 million birds. Their droppings have been proven to be carriers of the debilitating disease histoplasmosis. During the past year, 13 cases of this disease were reported in the Milan Hospital. Let me add that there is no known cure for this disease.

This enabling legislation was an extreme measure, but due to the severity of the situation, a necessary measure. At the outset, the issue surrounding the eradication of the birds seemed to be of an environmental and economic nature, but as time progressed, health quickly became the overriding issue. There could be no more of the time-consuming action required by court orders.

Time has been of the essence and with each passing day, the possibility of another child or an adult, for that matter, being struck with histoplasmosis, has grown greater and greater.

I am hopeful that the eradication program can be undertaken as quickly as proper certifications by Governors Ray Blanton and Julian Carroll are made. On behalf of the people of Tennessee, I would like to offer my thanks for the responsive action taken by this body.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PRAYER BREAKFAST

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, at the President's prayer breakfast this morning, during which our colleague, Representative RICHARDSON PREYER, presided, and Senators ALLEN and HATFIELD spoke, the President quoted Benjamin Franklin in a passage particularly relevant to our deliberations in this House.

The President said:

Benjamin Franklin, addressing himself to religious faith and worship of God in the society in which he lived, told the framers of the Constitution: "Without God's concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests. Our projects will be confounded and we ourselves shall become a byword and a reproach down to future ages."

Often, as I walk into the office, I realize that man's wisdom and strength are not sufficient, so I try to practice the truth of proverbs 3:5-6: "Trust in the Lord with all thy heart; lean not on thine own understanding; in all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy path."



# NEW NATURAL GAS NOT WORTH 42 TIMES THE REGULATED PRICE

**HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague from New Jersey's Second Congressional District, WILLIAM J. HUGHES, put the controversy over regulation versus deregulation in proper perspective through his testimony January 22 before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Working with the General Accounting Office's own estimate of obtainable production additions available through deregulation within 3 years, Congressman HUGHES concludes that the 400 billion cubic feet of natural gas has a hidden price tag of \$22.50 per thousand cubic feet. This contrasts with the current average regulated price of 53 cents per thousand cubic feet.

And that, Congressman HUGHES testified, is a conservative estimate.

It did not consider the near certainty of a new price increase that would surely be dictated by the OPEC oil cartel which would be in the driver's seat once deregulation occurs.

Mr. HUGHES, in his statement, offers alternatives to capitulating to the international oil cartel and its multinational oil corporation partners.

I commend Congressman HUGHES for his presentation and urge, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues consider the issues he raises which I submit at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. HUGHES

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of this Subcommittee.

It was predicted six months ago that by now we might be meeting to discuss long-term resolution of the natural gas emergency amid the backdrop of industrial plant closings and thousands of new unemployed.

As the representative of an area with numerous factories that use natural gas as a feedstock, the thought of such a prospect is best not dwelled upon.

From all indications, most if not all sections of the country will likely ride out this winter's shortage originally forecast to be as great as 52 percent of the contract commitments of several interstate pipelines.

A warmer winter, some say.

Add to that emergency purchases of natural gas by interstate pipelines, the utilization of more expensive fuel substitutes and, I would add, the scrutiny of this and other Congressional Committees, and this winter's supply picture has considerably improved.

Now those who overstated this winter's emergency are advising this Committee that our long-term interests are best served by deregulation, phased or sudden. These deregulation advocates include not only the gas industry but the Federal Energy Administration and the reluctant regulators at the Federal Power Commission as well.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they are guilty of overstating their case once again.

I do not doubt that production is declining, that is obvious. What I do question is the industry's assessment at how we arrived at where we are today and where we go from here.

Deregulation in the absence of government access to the same reserve and production data available to the industry and the authority to order maximum production or lose lease rights on existing federal lands would, in my opinion, be sheer folly.

It is no less attractive in the phased setting as contemplated by the Senate passed Pearson-Bentsen bill, S. 2310. Because in the present non-competitive market in which oil prices are set, immediate or phased deregulation is tantamount to a surrender announcement to the oil exporting nations.

Clearly, we cannot permit our energy policy to be determined by nations that produce oil for 11 cents a barrel and sell it to us for \$12.

## THE COST OF DEREGULATION

In the last few weeks, in separate reports issued by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office, we are able to assess the economic trade-offs that would follow House agreement to the Pearson-Bentsen bill.

The GAO, citing what it believes are obtainable goals under deregulation, forecasts a difference of an additional 400 billion cubic feet of natural gas over what would be produced in three years should regulation continue.

The Library of Congress' December 31 estimate of the first-year impact of gas deregulation to consumers is in the range of \$12.8 to \$14.9 billion for little, if any, additional supply. This is because of the two to three year lead time between accelerated exploration and marketing of new commercial quantities of gas.

What we would not have to await is an energy shock throughout the economy.

The Library of Congress further estimates the ripple effect of \$13 to \$15 billion as likely to produce an inflationary rate of between 1.2 and 1.4 percentage points. Unemployment is forecast to increase by several hundred thousand.

And for what? To transfer dollars from consumers to producers on the somewhat shaky premise that these mega-bucks will be invested in starches for new gas supplies in sufficient quantities to make it all worthwhile.

Further, we have no guarantee that this new found wealth would be reinvested in exploration at all. It could just as easily be used to purchase department stores or a three ring circus.

A commendation is in order at this point to the Chairman and the majority on this Subcommittee who drew the line on deregulation and, instead, approved limited deregulated sales to interstate commerce for this winter season and next.

Because despite what those in the industry say publicly, Mr. Chairman, this issue has not been studied to death and won't be as long as this Committee continues to have its requests for reserve and production estimates denied on grounds of protecting proprietary information.

## AN ALTERNATIVE TO CAPITULATION

My constituents and those of many other Congressmen are on the receiving end of interstate pipelines. In the case of my South Jersey district, we have one pipeline, one distributor and no choice.

In the next few days, I will be introducing for reference to this Subcommittee legislation which in my opinion will insure maximum domestic production at lowest possible consumer prices.

It presents an alternative to capitulation to the OPEC cartel and the major multinational oil companies by establishing a fair price for natural gas and procedures to end the wasteful misallocation of this precious resource that has resulted from the lack of a uniform and coherent national policy.

Most importantly, it would end uncer-

tainty. As long as producers believe there is a good chance that they may enjoy deregulated prices tomorrow, they are not likely to strive for maximum production today.

First and foremost, the bill establishes parity between the interstate and intrastate markets by setting a single pricing system for all gas.

Prices set by the bill would be adjusted for inflation, and could be raised by showing the Federal Power Commission that actual costs are not recouped but, aside from these adjustments, will remain in force for five years.

Other sections establish a fair system for allocating existing supplies throughout the country, incorporates conservation features and, provides for the forfeiture of non producing leases, and, as even deregulation advocates now endorse, phases out the use of natural gas as a boiler fuel.

Philosophically, I do not advocate tight government regulation. In a competitive industry, the fewer controls the better—the market will set the price.

But we need only examine the most commonly cited argument for deregulation to expose the myth of competition in the oil and gas industry.

## 21 YEARS OF REGULATION

The most absurd assertion, usually compounded by the appearance of a full page ad is that the Congress and the Federal Power Commission are responsible for the present crisis by keeping prices artificially low through 21 years of federal regulation.

Up until 1968, when President Nixon was elected on a pledge to reduce federal regulation, we had all the natural gas we thought we could possibly use.

The producers, the pipelines and the distributors couldn't sell it fast enough. They entered into 10, 15 and 20-year contracts. Discounts were given to builders who agreed to pipe in gas to housing developments.

For many years after the Supreme Court ordered the F.P.C. to regulate gas prices at the wellhead in 1954, the industry continued to get a better price on the interstate market than within producing states.

This remained the case until late 1970 when interstate gas was sold at a good profit for an average price of 29 cents per thousand cubic feet in both markets.

Proven reserves in fact peaked at 292.9 trillion cubic feet in 1968 but, despite significant price increases in recent years, continues to decline.

Coinciding with a decline and revision of reserve estimates was a gradual shift to the unregulated intrastate market which became a stampede in the winter of 1973 where gas producers were obtaining cartel prices.

Since 1970, more than 90 percent of reserve additions in the lower 48 states have been dedicated to the intrastate market.

In the meantime on federal lands, where gas discoveries are by law dedicated to the interstate regulated system, discoveries and production continued a rapid decline.

Which brings forth a second industry argument, that of industry concentration. It is said that there are some 30,000 producers; that the four major oil companies control but 24 percent of the market and that the 8 largest firms 42 percent, low when compared to other industries.

## INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION

Dr. David Schwartz, former Assistant Chief of the Office of Economics at the Federal Power Commission, draws an important distinction between market holdings and new reserves. In the latter category, an FPC study found that the eight largest natural gas companies which, not incidentally, are among the largest oil producers, control between 62 percent and 99 percent of new reserves depending on the gas field involved.

And there are not 30,000 producers operat-

ing offshore where the Interior Department through witless leasing policies has assisted industry concentration to a handful of major firms.

Eight major firms control 70 percent of the available known supplies of natural gas onshore and offshore South Louisiana, four of which hold nearly 50 percent; the eight largest firms in the Texas Gulf Coast control 90 percent of available new gas not yet under contract there, the four largest just under 80 percent.

In the combined fields, eight majors control three-quarters of the new gas finds with the concentration ratio around 50 percent for the four major firms. An eight firm concentration ratio of 50 percent or more is generally regarded as indicative of non-competitive structure within a given industry.

Is it really any wonder, then, given the level of industry concentration in our regulated offshore waters, that these are not being produced with all due haste? The prospect of total deregulation by 1981 as contemplated by the Pearson-Bentsen bill and an initial price hike to \$1.60 per thousand cubic feet would make it all worth waiting for.

More than 750 or 52 percent of the 1,497 leases in the Gulf of Mexico are in nonproducing status. Those that are, according to testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee are operating at less than half capacity.

The number of leases in extended term, at last count, was 74. By law, the Interior Department is empowered to yank those leases and resell them to another buyer who can come across with a reliable production plan.

To determine why these offshore reserves are not being developed, I sought and was granted the right to intervene in current proceedings before the F.P.C. into the status of nonproducing reserves.

It was a real education. Producer witness after producer witness claimed equipment shortages, lack of capital and repair delays as excuses for nonproduction.

Yet while these producers were shouting equipment shortages to the F.P.C. across town, at the Export-Import Bank, international representatives for the very same firms were whispering surplus into the ears of those from whom they were seeking loan guarantees.

This, then, is the root of the suspicion of many in this country who believe we'll get all the gas we need domestically at \$2.50 or more per thousand cubic feet, or whatever the escalating cost of Btu equivalent alternative fuels is six months or a year from today.

I do not share the belief that production will suddenly leap upon deregulation, but I am dead certain that whatever we do get we'll pay cartel prices for it.

#### AUTOS AND ENERGY

To the argument that the gas industry is no more concentrated than, say, the automobile industry, the obvious reply is that you can take a bus, ride a bike, or keep the repair shop happy. There are alternatives which automobile manufacturers must keep in mind in pricing their product, but there is only one commodity that can come out of the end of that pipe to heat your home or run our factories.

A constant supply of new energy, unlike a constant supply of new cars, has become a necessity of life. During this period of extreme shortage, thoughtful allocation of this resource is essential.

Unlike the auto industry, gas producers don't offer rebates to stimulate sales.

A final word on the implications of price fixing, especially as it bears on new contracts suggested by the few producers of Alaskan natural gas.

As a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial

Law, I was recently furnished a copy of a classic cartel contract under negotiation between Arco and a California utility.

It said, simply, that in no case will gas be sold for less than the maximum price then being obtained by any supplier of Alaskan pipeline gas. Were I an antitrust lawyer at the Justice Department, I would gladly volunteer to prosecute that case.

These, then, are several arguments and rebuttals to deregulation.

It may be that what this nation needs is a restructuring of the oil industry rather than deregulation of natural gas prices.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am currently reviewing the legal obstacles to the timely prosecution of antitrust suits. There is no reason why antitrust suits at the Federal Trade Commission and in the Justice Department should drag on for years without resolution.

The Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law continues to hold hearings on legislation that would accomplish vertical and/or horizontal divestiture of the oil industry.

Pending the outcome of these hearings, it is a serious mistake to precipitously deregulate natural gas prices and further surrender the power of the government to keep any lid at all on prices.

#### THE GAO BLUNDER

In closing, permit me to comment on the principal conclusion, and therefore the principal blunder, contained in the January 14 General Accounting Office report entitled: "Implications of Deregulating The Price on Natural Gas."

Total new gas discoveries under deregulation would amount to approximately 400 billion cubic feet more after three years when compared to continued regulation.

This, trumpets the report, could reduce our oil imports by 750,000 barrels per day and improve our balance of payments by up to \$3 billion.

While 400 billion cubic feet of natural gas sounds impressive in isolation it is, after all, only a two percent increase over the 19.4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that the GAO estimates will be available under continued regulation.

The total additional cost to consumers under deregulation is estimated by the G.A.O. at \$9 billion. So, for \$9 billion, industrial, commercial and residential users would have access to an additional 400 billion cubic feet of natural gas which is the equivalent of \$22.50 per thousand cubic feet.

Thus, for a two percent increase in natural gas supplies through deregulation the consumer would pay 42 times the current regulated price. And that is a conservative estimate.

Where the GAO report errs, fatally, is in forecasting figures based upon the preposterous assumption that the OPEC oil cartel, now in the driver's seat with deregulation, will not act to recoup any loss in revenues occasioned by a drop in U.S. oil imports.

The GAO compounds its error by assuming in the ten-year life of its study (1975-1985) that the international market will remain stable with no OPEC price hikes.

There are other serious deficiencies in the latest GAO report—assumptions which, I am sure, many on this Subcommittee have already challenged.

The report in assessing consumer impact, for example, considers a rise in natural gas prices to the Btu equivalency of crude oil (about \$1.70 per Mcf) rather than to its actual rivals, propane and No. 2 fuel oil which have a Btu price equivalent of around \$2.50 per Mcf. The latter estimate, again by the Library of Congress, is more reliable since it measures comparable fuels.

This accounts for the first-year impact difference of \$9 billion by the GAO and the

\$12 to \$15 billion price tag affixed by the Library.

Finally, nowhere does the GAO report examine the option of regulating the intrastate market as an alternative to the status quo or deregulation.

A final argument could be made that even 400 billion cubic feet at an exorbitant rate is better than no new gas at all. I disagree that we necessarily have to make such a choice.

Uncertainty is the real culprit. I am not convinced that this is an either/or situation. The establishment of parity between the interstate and intrastate system that provides for a good return on investment may very well be all that is required to again attract exploration investments.

In the final analysis, the central question is not as complex as the side issues.

What we must decide is whether we can afford to let an international oil cartel and the multinational oil corporations which owe allegiance to no nation determine our future energy policies. An industry that can set the price for gas and oil will ultimately determine the price for alternative fuels as well. An industry that powerful will soon be telling the government how much tax it will pay and under what conditions it will continue to supply this nation with energy. Clearly this we cannot permit.

#### LEAKING OF INTELLIGENCE

#### HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contained the comments of Eric Sevareid concerning the unfortunate situation we find ourselves in regarding oversight of our country's intelligence community. The leaking of the proposed report of the Select Committee on Intelligence to the media indicates a fatal weakness in permitting access to information concerning covert operations to large groups possessing varying degrees of reliability.

I should like to share Mr. Sevareid's comments with my colleagues:

#### COMMENTS OF ERIC SEVAREID

The Senate's doubt about Mr. Bush's suitability springs from his career in party politics . . . A more real question is his toughness. The CIA requires a man with a touch of ruthlessness, to keep the CIA activities within the bounds of common sense, but also to stand against the current crop of zealots, including some congressmen and their assistants who do not seem to care how badly this weapon for security is weakened in a rough world.

New supervisory monitoring machinery can be tried but it will not solve the dilemma of a democracy struggling short of war, but worldwide, with a totalitarian regime: The need for frequent secrecy versus the need of Congress and the public to know what is being done in the country's name. Solution is impossible, a better balance is not . . .

We've had CIA officials domestically breaking the domestic law in the name of some higher law of their own selection. We've had congressmen breaking solemn agreements with executives by leaking classified information in the name of higher laws of their selection. We've had journalists breaking their word on information received off the record by leaking it to other journalists . . .

And we've had much worse. We've had American zealots publishing the names of



American intelligence personnel, which in this time of terrorists everywhere increases the risk of kidnapping and murder . . . To do this is to commit the moral equivalent of treason, treason to the very humanitarian principles the zealots think they are upholding. When these agents die—and they are not all American nationals by any means—they die as anonymously as they live. So we may never know.

## STATE OF THE UNION, 1976

## HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report entitled, "State of the Union, 1976":

## STATE OF THE UNION, 1976

In the 188th State of the Union Message given by an American president, President Ford, appealing for a "new realism", struck the grand design of his 1976 campaign for the Presidency: a reduced role for government, the focus on domestic, rather than foreign affairs, a bigger defense budget, tax incentives to spur the economy, and the consolidation of many federal programs with more flexibility given to the states and localities in their use of federal money.

The President's address, which will probably be his most important speech this year, was substantially more upbeat than his address last year when he said that the State of the Union was not good. This year, taking a favorable view of the state of the nation's health, he said, "The state of the union is better—in many respects a lot better—but still not good enough." The prevailing tone of the speech was optimistic.

Repeatedly he used the Bicentennial theme and references to the founding fathers to call the nation back to the great principles upon which it was founded. He employed the phrase "common sense" often, drawing from Tom Paine's revolutionary war publication of that title. He stressed that America in the recent past has overreached itself, suggested that massive federal programs worsened the economy, and said that the time had come to start putting things right by slowing the increase in government's spending and trying to balance the budget in four years. He does not expect to reduce the size of government, but he wanted no massive new government incursions into society, and stressed that government must have modest ambitions. He carefully avoided any sharp changes in government policy that might disrupt the economy or the social system.

In his major new legislative proposals, he asked the second session of the 94th Congress to cut federal taxes by \$10 billion, to slow the recent average annual federal budget growth rate of 10 percent to 5 percent with expenditures of \$394.2 billion, to bolster the Social Security Trust Fund with additional taxes, to consolidate 59 Federal grant programs, and to provide tax breaks for family farms, small investors and small businesses.

The President took credit for the partial economic recovery and he confidently asserted it would continue, rejecting the claims of some persons who believe that the economic upturn may peter out or be swallowed up in a resurgent inflation. The health of the economy, he said, is dependent on a leveling off in the growth of government spending and a reduced role for government. Taking a dim view of the capacity of federal programs to produce jobs, he called on Congress to provide tax incentives for business to help create new jobs in the private sector.

By proposing a deflationary economic policy, the President is gambling that inflation is a more serious liability than unemployment (which runs counter to the traditional political principle that the unemployment rate is the most sensitive statistic in a campaign).

Reflecting his polling data, which show that his position on law enforcement was not clear to the American people, the President, in an unusually lengthy section of his speech, mapped his anti-crime proposals, including longer and mandatory prison terms and more federal prisons. He also followed the polls by focusing principally on the domestic economy. He devoted less than 1/6 of his speech to foreign policy and called for military power without equal and an intelligence capability that is the best in the world. He was not specific on how he would reform the nation's intelligence services. Some of his sternest language dealt with his concern that Congress has imposed unwarranted restrictions on foreign policy. He appealed for "strong central direction" of American foreign policy.

Politically, it was obvious that the President was seeking to place himself on the conservative middle ground. He swiped at Governor Reagan's controversial proposal for a \$90 billion cut-back in federal welfare spending by saying that we cannot drop welfare into the laps of state and local government. But he also rejected proposals that the federal government be the employer of last resort and that larger public jobs and public works programs be undertaken. He proposed a catastrophic health insurance program limited to the elderly and abandoned entirely his support for national health insurance.

The President is on sound ground in urging that the deficit in the Social Security Fund be closed. To shore up the Social Security System, which he said was headed for trouble, he called for an increase in the tax rate, but he reversed his position of last year and endorsed the payment to social security recipients of the full cost of living increase due this year. The debate in the Congress on this proposal will come on whether the increased taxes should be raised as the President suggests by higher taxes on workers and employers, or by a combination of a rate increase and a rise in the income base to make the tax change less regressive.

The chief criticism of the President's speech centers on what was not said. The unemployed are not given much hope. Neither are public institutions, like schools, hospitals, libraries, parks and transit systems. No mention is made of race relations or urban and rural development. Welfare reform was brushed aside as too complex. Foreign policy problems were ignored, as were the claims of those who want cleaner air and water.

The President's address was not especially challenging, nor was it intended to be. His speech reflects a modest vision of America, with no great plans to change American society, and a limited role for government.

SCRANTON, PA., CELEBRATES  
BICENTENNIAL

## HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening the Bicentennial city of Scranton, Pa., officially began its celebration of the Nation's 200th birthday with a gala community dinner dance at the St. Mary's Center in Scranton. This

birthday ball was a sparkling way to kick off the community's Bicentennial, and it attracted a spirited crowd of over 750 residents.

It was my great privilege to address this distinguished gathering of Scrantonians, and, under the leadership of Bicentennial Coordinator David Wenzel and Bicentennial Citizens Chairman Betty Fleth, a number of our leading citizens participated in the evening's program. The Reverend Vernon Searfoss served as toastmaster for the evening and introduced a program of speakers such as Rev. Kenneth Trexler, St. Peter's Lutheran Church, and Rt. Rev. Anthony M. Rysz, Bishop of the Polish National Catholic Church; Hon. James J. Walsh, Lackawanna County court judge; Mrs. Jeanne Madden Martin, who led the group in song; Mayor Eugene Peters, and Miss Mary Savage, the Bicentennial Logo Award Winner.

Mr. Speaker, the city has adopted an ambitious program of events for the coming year that will involve all segments of the community and touch all phases of our Bicentennial program. In the coming months there will be special celebrations in our schools, a town meeting to openly discuss the needs and problems of the city, a "Trash Ball" combined with environmental improvement programs, recreation, and numerous other cultural, historical, and social activities, all designed to stress that the Bicentennial in Scranton will not be a spectator sport but will be open to participants from all across the community.

The city of Scranton has set numerous goals to making the Bicentennial a meaningful experience: to contribute to the national Bicentennial celebration, to establish greater civic pride, to reaffirm the ideals of the American Revolution, to increase our awareness of the rich cultural heritage of northeastern Pennsylvania, to improve the quality of life in America, and to leave a lasting reminder of the effort put forth by the citizens of Scranton.

A tremendous bicentennial salute should go forth to Scranton Mayor Eugene Peters, to Mr. Wenzel, and to Mrs. Fleth. Under their exceptional planning and leadership, last Saturday's kickoff celebration was a tremendous success. I know the people of Scranton can look forward to an exciting and enjoyable bicentennial year.

CONGRESSMAN CONYERS DISPUTES  
OFFICIAL UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

## HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, President Ford unveiled his budget last week and, appealing to "commonsense," tried to justify an unemployment rate of 7.7 percent for this year and 6.9 percent for 1977. Such joblessness, he assures us, is necessary to fight inflation and "meet the test of fiscal responsibility."

Appalling as these figures are, they grossly understate the true level of unemployment. The Department of Labor calculates unemployment in such a way as to conceal its real extent, an unemployment rate closer to 15 percent. In an article on the Op-Ed page of the January 1, 1976, issue of the New York Times, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. JOHN CONYERS, JR., takes a hard look at unemployment figures, what they hide and what they mean. He calls to our attention the fact that, because of the Labor Department's method of computation, some 5.3 million discouraged workers who have been searching for jobs so long that they have stopped looking do not fit the official designation of unemployed and thus are not included in published statistics. He also points out that, by not taking into account the plight of the 3.6 million additional workers who are forced to work part-time because they cannot find full-time jobs, the published statistics further mislead us.

I found his humane and accurate assessment of our unemployment situation informative and helpful and would like to take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues:

**JOBLESS NUMBERS**  
(By John Conyers, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Early this month, the Labor Department announced its latest statistics on employment in the United States. The number of jobless dropped from 8 million in October to 7.7 million in November, causing the unemployment rate to decline from 8.6 percent to 8.3 percent (a good sign!). At the same time, the number of jobs decreased slightly, from 85.44 million to 85.28 million (not such a good sign!).

These figures had to be disappointing to the Ford Administration, which hoped that the upsurge in jobs and production registered during the third quarter of this year would continue. Nevertheless, it assured us that economic recovery was still rolling along. Just more slowly than hoped.

A closer look at the figures, as appalling as they are, reveals a chilling picture. The fact is that for millions of blacks as well as whites the job scene is incredibly bleak. The crucial statistic, the one showing the number of employed, remained almost motionless.

Even more critical is the fact that the Government's method for calculating unemployment is rigged, deliberately designed to conceal the true level, understating it by almost half.

According to the National Urban League, nearly 15 million persons (not the 7.7 million officially admitted by the Labor Department) are jobless, and the unemployment rate is 15 percent. For blacks, conditions are worse, for the official rate of 13.8 percent, when adjusted, soars to 26 percent.

How does the Labor Department slant the statistics? The method is fairly simple. It merely defines in very narrow terms who is unemployed and calls many people employed who are not, in any real sense.

Amazingly, millions who searched for jobs so long that they stopped looking are not considered officially jobless, because they don't fit the department's "unemployed" category (they must have looked for jobs within the four weeks preceding the monthly survey). Thus, in a stroke, some 5.3 million discouraged workers are written off the rolls.

Who else is omitted? The 3.6 million forced to work on the average half a week because they can't find full-time jobs but who, when asked in the monthly survey, say they would take one immediately if it were offered.

If we add the 5.3 million discouraged workers and just half the part-time workers (1.8 million) to the official 7.7 million, the number of unemployed soars to 14.8 million. For blacks the numbers surge from 1.5 to 3.1 million.

Who is called employed? The Labor Department includes the 3.6 million part-time workers. It also includes the unpaid family workers who don't receive wages but help on family farms and stores and share in the family income, generally because no other jobs are available. The department also labels employed those millions who work for wages beneath the official poverty line (\$5,400). At present, over 25 percent of black workers in this country work for poverty wages, but they, like the part-time and unpaid family workers, land in the Labor Department's "employed" column, just as if they earned, say, \$35,000 a year.

What does this mean? For those forced into part-time work, life is a daily search for more secure, full-time work with full-time pay. For those working for poverty wages, there is the incessant struggle to survive on that pay, as well as the realization that they must hang on to their jobs.

And for those luckier workers with better paying jobs, there is a vivid awareness that they must tame any demands for higher pay or improved work conditions.

For industry, the vast numbers of jobless, part-time and low-paid workers mean a huge supply of cheap labor when the business cycle picks up.

For obvious reasons, the Government must hide the extraordinary extent of unemployment, of wasted, idle lives and productive capacity. Indeed if the truth were known, the public outcry would be so great, so unrelenting, that it would be forced to act, to guarantee jobs now and at livable wages. And this is precisely what the present Administration is unwilling to do. Instead, it would leave the matter to the "market," to "supply and demand," to chance.

In fact, Government spokesmen now talk of acceptable unemployment rates in the 7 percent range. Yet only a few years ago, such pronouncements would have been attacked as intolerable. But since the Administration is aware that vast unemployment is the tool that allows big business to extract its profits it asserts that joblessness is an economic necessity.

To reduce the current "official" unemployment rate to 5 percent by 1985, over 37 million jobs are needed; 8 million for the present jobless, 15 million to accommodate the normal population increase, and 12 million more to compensate for those jobs lost because of technological advances in industry.

But over the last ten years, according to "The 1975 Manpower Report of the President," only 16.5 million new jobs were created, and most of these were in low-paying industries.

The task of public policy must be to turn that around, to put people to work for people, rather than for profits. Unless we act now and support legislation being proposed in Congress that would insure each worker, the right to a job the outlook for American workers will be only a replay of the present—No work, no wages, no self-respect and no hope of change.

**NEW YORK: THE CRISIS STILL LOOMS**

**HON. DEL CLAWSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the "day of reckoning" for New York City can be postponed. That is what has been

accomplished. But if the Federal Government continues to act in the apparent assumption that the reckoning can be permanently avoided it becomes a partner in the evasive tactics described in the column by George F. Will which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The column follows for the information of my colleagues:

**NEW YORK: THE CRISIS STILL LOOMS**  
(By George F. Will)

NEW YORK—An ominous question again is banking like a thunderhead on the political horizon. It is whether Washington should cough up yet another "final" installment of "emergency" aid for this city. In just six weeks the most recent "solution" to the city's crisis has begun to wilt.

That solution was the federal government's "Seasonal Financing Act." It was so named to convey the fiction that all the city needed, or wanted, was aid to help it through a hard but short "season." But the fact, which city politicians at least understood, is that the city won federal aid by making scary noises, not sacrifices. That guaranteed that the city would shun major sacrifices, and let the crisis become permanent—a crisis for all seasons.

In mid-October New York's Gov. Hugh Carey announced that the city had "exhausted all of its resources." In fact the city had not moved to cut expenditures or raise revenues by attacking the major middle-class subsidies—rent control which depresses the tax base; free tuition at City University; lavish pension plans for the strongest municipal unions. The city still has not seized these nettles.

(Zebras do not vote, so the city has closed the Bronx Zoo's zebra house. The city also is extending the sales tax to massage parlors.)

The city's charade of trying to avoid default—a charade that stopped short of major sacrifices—was part of a test of wills between the city and Washington. It was a test the city won easily.

In exchange for loans of \$2.3 billion in each of the next three years, the city merely promised to balance its budget, and pay back each year's loan at the end of that year. The city buttressed this promise with encouraging projections of revenue increases and expenditure cuts.

At that time, a few sober persons asked two pertinent questions: Why does Washington believe that the city's promised economies will become real economies, and that its revenue projections, which are usually wrong (not to say crooked), are suddenly trustworthy? And what will Washington do if—when, really—it becomes apparent that New York City's promises regarding the money it borrows from Washington are no more serious than New York City's promises to people why buy its notes and bonds?

Already an independent auditing firm has told Washington that the city's current plans will not produce the promised balanced budget by 1978. According to the report, the city has made only \$12 million of the \$110 million in budget cuts it must make by mid-year. And the report warns that city revenues may have a \$571 million shortfall over the next three years. The city also needs an additional \$400 million to meet its cash requirements between now and June 30. Finally, the report says the city may need "additional permanent financing" from Washington in order to repay Washington's loans.

So, soon the Ford administration may be back at square one, squarely confronting this question: Why not force New York City to file for bankruptcy?

Six weeks ago the city won aid by successfully sowing the seeds of panic, saying that incalculable—but surely horrible—consequences would follow any default by the



city on its debt obligations. But as part of that very aid deal—a deal struck to avoid an “unthinkable” default—the city declared a “moratorium” on payment of its short-term debt.

Although lawyers can draw a distinction between “default” and “moratorium,” the distinction is about as important as the distinction (devised for the government’s convenience during Vietnam) between “bombing” and making “protective reaction strikes.” Because the city declared a moratorium, some people did not get paid when the city had promised to pay them. The city abrogated its contracts with note-holders, and it did so because it was politically easier to abrogate contracts than to raise taxes or cut expenditures.

But this default-called-moratorium did not reduce the economy to rubble. So when New York again comes to Washington as a mendicant, probably this spring, Washington should recognize that the “unthinkable”—orderly bankruptcy—is today, as it was six weeks ago, preferable to the alternative. The alternative is to allow the city to fasten itself on the nation’s treasury like a permanent leech.

#### GRAIN SCANDAL SHOWS NEED FOR LEGISLATION—VI

**HON. NEAL SMITH**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called attention to the massive grain inspection scandal at New Orleans and elsewhere, and have pointed out the need for reform.

If any additional evidence is needed to support the arguments for strong corrective legislation, it is provided by two developments in the last several days.

In the first development, Federal officials, merely by chance, visited a huge supertanker docked near New Orleans and prepared to set sail for Poland with a cargo of 3.2 million bushels of corn.

The grain, worth millions of dollars, had already been inspected by a private firm licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The private agency graded the corn as No. 3 Yellow.

In fact, according to press reports, the corn was musty and contaminated with rocks, seashells, and other foreign material and should have been given a much lower grade.

As the ship was being inspected, three Federal inspection supervisors somehow became trapped in one of the cargo tanks. The inspectors, one of whom has played a leading role in uncovering the scandal, managed to escape.

According to news accounts, Federal officials are investigating to determine whether the supervisors were intentionally locked in the cargo hold.

The Polish tanker incident can only be described as astonishing and bizarre.

Before the ship left for Poland, Federal officials revised the cargo certificate to reflect the actual condition of the corn. This will provide the basis for purchase price revisions.

In the second development, shortly before the tanker left for Poland, a Federal grand jury in New Orleans returned indictments for bribery and conspiracy

against three federally licensed grain inspectors.

The inspectors were employed by a State-chartered grain inspection agency at Baton Rouge.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD two articles by Mr. James Risser, a member of the Washington Bureau of the Des Moines Register.

It should now be clear to anyone who takes the time to study this problem that it is essential to reform the inspection system without further delay.

The House Agriculture Committee, late last session, voted to amend the U.S. Grain Standards Act to provide for Federal inspection of export grain.

The same provision, plus several other important changes which I feel are badly needed, is contained in a bill, H.R. 8764, which I have sponsored. While the House Agriculture Committee was working toward approval of a bill several weeks ago, the Senate Agriculture Committee announced that it would not act on any House-passed bill until a GAO report had been concluded. This delay until February also assured a further delay due to the Budget Act prohibiting action after January 1, 1976, on bills to be funded prior to October 1 of 1977.

The problems were already apparent and such a report should not have been a condition precedent to proceeding with legislation. The fact that the Senate was determined to delay further action naturally torpedoed progress on the House bill. It should now be even more obvious that further delay awaiting GAO reports is unnecessary and that action should be taken as soon as possible.

Following are the articles by the Mr. Risser, as well as a report from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 7 which is also of interest:

#### CORN CARGO MUSTY, DIRTY, CLARK SAYS

(By James Risser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A supertanker, docked near New Orleans, La., to carry grain to Poland, has been loaded with musty corn and corn containing rocks, seashells and other foreign material, Senator Dick Clark (Dem., Ia.) said Friday.

The Iowa Democrat said there is “substantial evidence” of “willful misgrading” of the 3.2-million-bushel cargo.

The corn was loaded last week at the Bay-side Elevator at Destrehan, La., owned by Cook Industries, Inc., a major grain exporter. A cook spokesman said Friday the company believes the shipment was properly graded.

It was inspected and graded as “No. three yellow corn” by licensed inspectors of the Destrehan Board of Trade, a private inspection agency designated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to conduct inspections at the Cook elevator.

“The high-level of foreign material, rocks and dust clearly puts it into the lower-priced ‘sample grade,’” Clark said.

#### THREE LOCKED IN TANK

The Register also learned that three Agriculture Department supervisory inspectors who went aboard the ship last Saturday to check on the condition of the cargo became locked inside one of the tanks.

One managed to escape by wriggling through a small hole, and released the other two. Federal agents reportedly are checking into the incident to determine if the three supervisors were intentionally locked in by someone else.

One of those locked inside was Harlan L.

Ryan, the grain division’s field office supervisor in New Orleans, sources here said. Ryan has played a leading role in uncovering the continuing export grain scandal.

Clark, who was in Des Moines Friday, said in a statement that information about the grading discrepancy was uncovered by Senate Agriculture Committee staff investigators who have examined the ship and interviewed participants in the incident.

#### WASHINGTON TALKS

Clark said he has information that Cook officials have been in Washington, meeting with Agriculture Department officials on the matter. Representatives of the department’s grain division went to New Orleans Friday to examine the cargo.

“In one hold of the ship, after licensed private inspectors had certified the grain as clean and had assigned a relatively high grade, federal supervisory inspectors found seashells the size of quarters, a pile of golf-ball size rocks that would fill a bushel basket, and substantial amounts of broken kernels and other foreign matter,” Clark said.

“Another hold was filled with sour and musty corn—conditions which should have resulted in rejection by the licensed inspector,” he said.

“A third hold disclosed a pile of corn screenings (small pieces of broken and damaged corn generally screened out of shipments) almost 25 feet high, and another contained a pile of pure corn dust that, I am told, had to amount to more than 10,000 cubic feet,” said Clark.

#### SHIP STILL AT DOCK

The ship still is tied up at Cook’s dock, while company and federal officials attempt to resolve the dispute.

Clark, who has been a leader in the congressional investigation of bribery, theft, misgrading, and misweighing of U.S. export grain, said, “There is no excuse for the high quality of grain being produced in this country being delivered to our overseas customers in less than the legally contracted condition.”

A spokesman at Cook Industries headquarters in Memphis, Tenn., said “we do not know of any evidence of any problems” with the shipment.

File samples of grain retained by the Destrehan Board of Trade inspectors appear to uphold the grades assigned by the inspectors to the shipment, the Cook official said.

#### “ERRONEOUS, MISLEADING”

“We have appealed through the proper channels,” he said, adding that statements claiming willful misgrading are “erroneous and misleading.”

The spokesman said that Cook had a similar dispute with federal supervisory inspectors over another shipment about a month ago. Cook was upheld in an appeal to Washington, he said.

Both Cook Industries and the Destrehan Board of Trade are under investigation by the U.S. attorney’s office in New Orleans and by a federal grand jury there, as part of the continuing probe into corruption in the export grain trade.

In testimony apparently unrelated to the Polish corn shipment, more than a dozen Cook employees appeared before the grand jury this week, it was learned.

Federal investigators suspect short-weighting and misgrading of grain shipped from the Cook elevator in the past.

[From the Des Moines Register, Jan. 20, 1976]

#### THREE GRAIN INSPECTORS INDICTED IN LOUISIANA

(By James Risser)

NEW ORLEANS, La.—Three inspectors employed by a state grain inspection agency at Baton Rouge, La., were indicted by a federal grand jury Monday for bribery and conspir-

acy in the intentional misgrading of export grain shipments.

The three, including the chief inspector of the agency, made \$67,000 in a six-month period by misrepresenting the quality of soybean shipments and sharing the profits with an elevator operator who participated in the scheme, the grand jury charged.

Named in the indictment were Dommenic Corrent, Jr., chief inspector for the Greater Baton Rouge Port Commission, and inspectors Anthony A. Danna and Edward M. Wyble.

The commission, a state-chartered agency, inspects, weighs and grades grain shipped to foreign buyers from the Cargill, Inc., elevator at Baton Rouge. All three are state civil service employees.

The new charges brought to 60 the number of inspectors, grain firms and grain company employees indicted in Louisiana and Texas in the past 17 months in a continuing investigation of corruption in the export grain trade.

It marked the first time that inspectors employed by a state-run agency have been accused. Inspectors previously indicted have been employees of private inspection firms, including boards of trades and grain exchanges.

Monday's charges are expected to be used by congressional proponents of all-federal grain inspection as evidence that state, as well as private, grain inspectors are susceptible to corruption.

Federal prosecutors said the investigation at Baton Rouge will continue and may produce more indictments. U.S. Agriculture Department officials are watching the situation closely and believe they may have to take over the commission's inspection duties.

The three inspectors were charged in a four-count indictment which could bring them sentences of up to five years in prison and \$10,000 in fines.

The indictments were presented in Baton Rouge to U.S. District Judge E. Gordon West by U.S. Atty. Douglas Gonzales.

Meanwhile, a Polish tanker loaded with 3.2 million bushels of corn was given qualified clearance to sail from New Orleans Monday after grain inspectors turned over their findings on the shipment to federal investigators.

"The ship will sail promptly," said a spokesman for Cook Industries, the giant Memphis, Tenn., grain export firm that owns the corn in the holds of the tanker Rysy II. The ship has been swinging at anchor since investigators for the Senate Agricultural Committee and federal supervisors claimed they discovered evidence the corn had been misgraded.

#### ENTERED INTO CONSPIRACY

According to the grand jury, Corrent, Danna and Wyble entered into a conspiracy in September, 1973, with Rufus J. Hebert, a Port Barre, La., grain elevator operator.

The three inspectors promised to "upgrade" soybeans which Hebert would ship to the Cargill elevator. As a result of a false high grade being assigned to the soybeans, Cargill would unknowingly pay Hebert for better quality beans than it actually received.

The inspectors then would collect from Hebert 20 to 30 per cent of the extra profit Hebert made as a result of the upgrading, the grand jury said.

In addition, it was alleged, the three inspectors "downgraded" other loads of grain coming into the Cargill elevator from other sellers so that the elevator's inventory records would match the quality of grain in the elevator.

#### PAID LESS

Some sellers apparently were paid less for their grain than they deserved.

Payments received by the three indicted inspectors from Hebert ranged from \$500 to \$9,000 on the 17 shipments of grain covered by the indictment.

Hebert's testimony before the grand jury was a key factor in Monday's indictment, prosecutors said.

Hebert pleaded guilty last fall to participating in a separate scheme involving the fraudulent sale of non-existent soybeans. He was sentenced to 30 days in prison, but the sentence later was suspended because of his poor health and because of his cooperation with the prosecutors investigating the Baton Rouge Commission.

#### INSPECTORS ARE LICENSED

All inspectors who examine and grade U.S. export grain, whether they work for private firms or state agencies, are licensed by the Grain Commission of the U.S. Agriculture Department.

While drafting a grain inspection reform bill last November, the House Agriculture Committee first voted to retain state inspection of export grain, largely on the strength of assertions by Representative W. Henson Moore, a Republican from Baton Rouge, that the Port Commission had been investigated and cleared of any wrongdoing.

However, after The Des Moines Register reported that the commission was still under active investigation, with criminal indictments imminent, Moore apologized to the committee for his error and the committee reversed itself, voting for all-federal inspection at export points.

The legislation is still pending in the House committee.

The Register also reported last August that the Senate Agriculture Committee had obtained Agriculture Department documents indicating a number of improper activities at the Baton Rouge Commission in the late 1960s and early 1970s, including:

Falsification of overtime work records by inspectors to obtain extra pay.

Acceptance by inspectors of dinners, football tickets, and other favors from grain and shipping officials in exchange for misgrading grain or certifying grain ships as being clean.

The rejection of a grain ship as being unfit for loading due to the presence of "water and rotten grain," followed by its approval one day later after commission inspectors and their wives were "wined and dined" by the shipowners.

Also, U.S. Atty. Gerald J. Gallinghouse of New Orleans has publicly criticized the Baton Rouge Commission managers for not responding to his warnings more than a year ago of corrupt activities by their inspectors.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Jan. 7, 1976]

#### CONGRESSMEN FAVOR CHANGE IN GRAIN INSPECTION SYSTEM

A congressional inspection tour of grain elevator operations here may result in a revamping of the present grain inspection system throughout the United States.

Four members of the U.S. House Agriculture Committee on the tour declared Tuesday they are strongly in favor of a change, and said their positions were reaffirmed as a result of their visit.

Claiming they will vote for legislation to replace private grain inspectors with an increased staff of federal inspectors were Reps. John Melcher, D-Mont.; Charles Thone, R-Neb.; and Tom Harkin and Berkley Bedell, both Democrats from Iowa. A fifth member of the visiting group, William Wampler, R-Va., also said he was leaning toward endorsing a federal inspection system, a reversal of a previously stated position.

The congressmen, on a three-day tour of Louisiana grain facilities, claimed they received new information here about the widespread nature of corruption in the grain industry.

The five congressmen said federal inspection at export elevators will almost certainly be included in a reform bill in the next session of Congress, which convenes Jan. 19.

If that happens, three private inspection agencies which inspect grain in the New Orleans area would be put out of business and the Greater Baton Rouge Port Commission would lose its authority to inspect grain.

The congressional group visited the Destrehan elevator of the Bunge Corp. late Tuesday afternoon and observed the process of diluting high quality grain to meet federal grade specifications. Bunge was convicted of stealing grain systematically by shortweighing its customers.

Wampler said his change of position in favor of federal inspectors came following a briefing Monday from U.S. Attorney Gerald Gallinghouse, who is conducting a federal probe into grain industry corruption. The Virginia congressman said he was impressed with Gallinghouse's contention that the grain companies had not tried to clean up corruptive practices within the industry.

Eugene Moos, agriculture committee staff analyst, said Gallinghouse depicted the current system of federally licensed but private grain inspectors as so corrupt and filled with conflicts of interest that it had to be replaced with a federal inspector system.

#### PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT CIA AGENTS IS NEEDED NOW

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in cosponsoring legislation which will make it a crime to disclose information leading to the identification of U.S. foreign intelligence agents by both employees and ex-employees or other persons, including the press.

The death of station chief Richard Welch in Athens on December 23, 1975, raised a serious question concerning governmental protection for CIA employees and their families. Clearly some type of legislation is needed to prevent leaks of sensitive information endangering the lives of agents.

In November, the Athens News printed Mr. Welch's name and address in a list of agents known to be staying in Greece. One month later Welch was gunned down in Athens. He was 1 of 32 CIA officers known to have died in the line of duty since 1947.

The Athens News extracted its information from other publications, including "Counter Spy," a Washington based anti-CIA magazine which has in the last 2 years identified 225 intelligence operatives around the world. Other similar publications include "Fifth Estate," and books written by former CIA agents Victor Marchette and Philip Agee.

Prosecution of either employees or ex-employees would take place if any information had been disclosed "willfully." Prosecution of others would take place if the information was released with the intent or belief that the release would prejudice the safety of the individual agent. A maximum fine of \$10,000 and a maximum sentence of 19 years or both would be established.

This bill in no way should be seen as a restrictive measure on the right to freedom of the press, but should be seen



as a protective measure insuring the right to privacy and the basic right to life. A member of any governmental agency, whether he is an elected official or a U.S. intelligence agent, should be secure in knowing that his Government is providing for his safety and well-being.

The CIA is a governmental agency involved in a controversy concerning its functions now and its eventual role in governmental operations. Both the Senate and the House have been conducting wide range investigations into official activities and possible reorganization of the agency. Their final report will soon be released.

But this controversy should not cloud our responsibilities to the agency employees. The question of the future need for the operations of the CIA is in no way connected with the present need to provide their employees and their families with protection.

I, for one, feel that the certain limits probably should be set on the activities of the CIA, but the need for overseas intelligence gathering both overt and covert is as valid today as it was during the 1940's when the CIA was first established.

If Congress and the American people decide at a later date to drastically reduce or eliminate the operations of the CIA, then this legislation will not be necessary. However it is needed today. It is needed to protect those Americans employed in service to the CIA from being assassinated. It is needed to prevent their families from enduring the anguish and hardships which the Welch family was forced to endure. It is needed for our national security and ability to survive in international affairs.

As a former policeman I am fully aware of the importance of keeping secret, certain operations of undercover men and informants engaged in police work. Failure to adhere to the secrecy rules many times resulted in their deaths. The need to protect CIA employees is no less important, and in fact is very essential to our national security.

I consider this to be priority legislation which deserves the swift attention and approval of Congress. We must demonstrate to the beleaguered employees of the Central Intelligence Agency that their safety and well-being is indeed our concern.

#### FEASIBILITY OF A 3 PERCENT IN 3 YEARS UNEMPLOYMENT GOAL

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the following thoughtful and valuable memorandum prepared by Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, which deals with the question of the feasibility of reducing unemployment to 3 percent within 3 years of enactment of H.R. 50-S. 50, as revised—the Hawkins-Humphrey-Reuss Full Employment legislation:

#### FEASIBILITY OF REDUCING UNEMPLOYMENT TO 3.0 PERCENT WITHIN 3 YEARS OF ENACTMENT OF HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL

(Leon H. Keyserling\*)

The Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976 proposes, in its present form and subject to further discussions among its principal sponsors, that unemployment be reduced to 3.0 percent within not more than three years of the enactment of such Act. (Accordingly, the contents of this memorandum represent only the views of its author at this stage, and these views are still open to further consideration.) Even assuming enactment toward the end of 1976, this would be nearly four years from the start of 1976.

In a Conference on Economic Progress study, *Full Employment Within Three Years*, authored by Leon H. Keyserling and published for release on February 2, 1976, the goal of reducing unemployment to 3.0 percent by the end of 1978 (three years from the start of 1976) is accompanied by the estimate that this would require an average annual U.S. real economic growth rate of 9.5 percent during this three year period, which would import less than 9.0 percent if the period were extended to nearly four years as indicated above.

On page 8 of Business Week of February 2, 1976 (in an article *Is Samuelson drifting to the Right?*, and citing his view that a U.S. real economic growth rate of 6-7 percent would be just what the nation needs in order to rekindle [sic] inflation), reference is made to the views of Professor James Tobin of Yale University, former President of the American Economic Association, recipient of many other high honors, and one of the ablest former members of the Council of Economic Advisers. These views are set forth as follows:

"Tobin argues that, after coming out of the steep recession, a 6 to 7 percent rate is just too low a target to shoot for, and that, given the low level of capacity utilization, the economy can grow 9 percent this year without any inflationary impact (italics added). Tobin wants fiscal and monetary stimuli to push the economy to this higher growth level."

Moreover, the Humphrey-Hawkins legislative proposal is not limited to "macro" fiscal and monetary measures, but in addition provides for a variety of specialized or "micro" measures to reduce unemployment. It also provides for a variety of measures to help restrain inflation. And the Keyserling study, referred to above, develops in detail the empirical evidence 1947-1975 that, contrary to the theory of the "trade-off", lower idle resources promote more price stability, and vice versa. On page 10 of Challenge, January-February 1976 issue, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns states: "Whatever may have been true in the past, there is no longer a meaningful trade-off between unemployment and inflation."

Dr. Burns further states in the same article:

"I believe that the ultimate objective of labor market policy should be to eliminate all (italics added) involuntary unemployment. This is not a radical or [sic] impractical goal. It rests on the simple but often neglected fact that work is far better than the dole, both for the jobless individual and the nation. A wise government will always strive to create an environment that is conducive to high employment in the private sector. Nevertheless, there may be no way to reach the goal of full employment short of making the government an employer of last resort. This could be done by offering public employment—for example, in hospitals, schools, public parks or the like—to anyone

\* Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman. President, Conference on Economic Progress.

who is willing to work at a rate of pay somewhat below the Federal minimum wage."

The author of this memorandum applauds this statement by Dr. Burns, except for complete dissent on all economic and social grounds to the proposal to depress all wage levels and standards by public example. The author is also puzzled as to how Dr. Burns can reconcile his awakening as to the invalidity of the "trade-off" with the persistent policy of the Federal Reserve Board, directed toward recurrent high levels of idle workers and other productive resources in the name of restraining inflation, but accompanied in fact by increased inflation.

The Keyserling study, referred to above, also develops the fact that the basic performance of the economy, in terms of employment, production, and sound and equitable distribution of real purchasing power and of goods and services, is more important than price trends *per se*, and that price trends are to be evaluated primarily by their effects upon these other objectives.

The Humphrey-Hawkins proposal is consistent with all of the foregoing positions taken in this memorandum.

In addition to Professor Tobin and the author of this memorandum, there are other leading economists who join in the position that a more rapid rate of real economic growth than the 6-7 percent rate of real economic growth forecast by the current national Administration (and some others) in consequence of its declared fiscal policies (and Federal Reserve Board policies) is necessary and attainable. For example, on page 54 of the Business Week of February 2, 1976 (cited above), Walter Heller and others are referred to as follows:

"Heller and other Keynesians stress the relationship between fiscal policy and economic growth. For the short run the liberals—including those who fully expect the recovery to keep to a six percent path—think the economy can afford to grow faster without any significant risk of higher inflation. With the amount of unemployment and idle capacity that the Administration itself forecasts for the next few years [note also its forecasts for inflation] liberals see no excuse for not pushing harder to end what they consider a waste of \$150 billion or more a year in potential output [clearly now \$250 billion or more (see Keyserling study, cited above)]."

Further support for the economic growth and reduction of unemployment set forth in this memorandum (consistent with the Humphrey-Hawkins proposal), the following forecasts of the consequences of adherence to the Administration's proposals are set forth in the above cited issue of Business Week.

Walter Heller (p. 51), former President of the American Economic Association and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, is skeptical as to whether even a 6-7 percent forecast is realistic without a money growth rate of 8-10 percent, above the upper end of Dr. Burns' 5-7.5 percent targets, and way above the 2 percent monetary growth rate of the past six months.

Otto Eckstein, President of Data Resources Inc., aware that the annual rate of real economic growth was only 5.4 percent in fourth quarter 1975, states (p. 51): "In terms of final sales, [real] growth this year [1976] will be about 4.6 percent—the lowest gain for any postwar recovery."

Lawrence Klein, President-elect of the American Economic Association, and head of Wharton-EFA Inc., predicts (p. 51) that real growth will drop to 4.0 percent in the second half [of 1976].

Arthur Okun, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, states (p. 54): "What the optimists are saying is that we were 15 ft. under water before, and that by election time we'll be 7 ft. under water, and that's supposed to make everybody happy."

With [as of November 1976] inflation still eroding incomes at a 6 percent rate, and unemployment still above 7 percent, I just can't believe that levels won't matter."

Business Week also says (p. 54): "Furthermore, liberals are not about to miss the point that Ford's proposed increase of 9 percent in defense spending and an allowance for an 18.7 percent increase in interest costs on the Federal debt [a poignant illustration of Federal Reserve Board policies] bite still deeper into funds available for civilian programs.

After adjusting for these increases and inflation federal outlays would drop by 5.1 percent."

And Business Week further states (p. 55): "Gary Fromm of the National Bureau of Economic Research, for example, estimates that Ford's budget would cut next year's [1977] real growth rate by \$19 billion, and other economists calculate it would cost the economy half a million jobs in 1977. To Klein of Wharton, who sees the economy flagging even without Ford's \$395 billion spending

ceiling, the new budget could tip the economy back toward recession."

These depressing forecasts—whether right or wrong in detail—reflect the wrong emphasis. Our national interests and future depend upon an immediate shift of emphasis from forecasts of what will happen to us if we continue to do the wrong things to progressive attention to what we can and must do to get the right results. This, in a nutshell, is the core meaning of the Humphrey-Hawkins proposal.

## SENATE—Friday, January 30, 1976

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this reverent moment, before facing the pressing problems of state, or talking to one another, we would talk to Thee and hear again Thy "still small voice" deep within us. Help us to "be still and know that Thou art God"—reigning in majesty and holiness above all men and nations—but speaking in love and wisdom to all who open their lives to Thee. Into Thy hands we commit ourselves, our causes, our country. Keep us steadfast and true, pure in motive and clean in heart. Subdue all low impulses, and grant to us the higher grace of loving Thee with our "whole mind and soul and strength and our neighbor as ourselves."

We ask it in that name which is above every name. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUMPERS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 29, 1976, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all

committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(All nominations confirmed today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to be recognized?

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 302

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 302, a resolution to establish a select committee of the Senate to conduct an investigation and study of the extent, if any, to which criminal or other illegal, improper, or

unethical activities are engaged in by any persons acting individually or in combination with others in the field of labor-management relations; and also add the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) now in the chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

### PRODUCTION OF MINUTEMAN III

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, last week, the President issued his budget, which by and large takes the correct direction with respect to our economic and defense problems. I was happy to see the modest increase in military spending requested by the President. The realities of the international situation, and the relative decline in our defensive capability over the last few years certainly justify that action.

In that connection, there is one aspect of the budget that has really upset me. That is the lack of continued funding for production of the Minuteman III ICBM. The reason for the elimination of this important program was not given, of course, in the budget message, and it is not yet entirely clear. Explanations given by the President's advisers at briefings on the budget, and appearing in the press, attributed to anonymous sources, have not made sense to me. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has made the most systematic attempt to defend the decision, and I will deal with his argument in a moment.

For a moment, Mr. President, I would like to discuss the Minuteman system, the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union, as I see it, and the impact of elimination of the system on our defensive capability and on our economy.

To begin with, we need to consider the accords reached as a result of the first round of strategic arms limitations talks—SALT I.

Under the 1972 agreement, the United States was limited to 1,054 ICBM's, as compared to the Soviet limit of 1,618. These limits, besides being unequal on their face, ignored the fact that actual Soviet throw weight was many times greater than ours.

In the years following SALT I, the Soviet Union converted many light mis-